Ruth Gorham Griesemer

Jubbulpur Convention.
1923. India.

THE

HINDUSTANI LANGUAGE

BY

REV. W. HOOPER, D.D.,

Canon of Lucknow.

MADRAS:

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY FOR INDIA.

1917.

PREFACE.

The origin of this book must be traced to a request, from my late dear and revered brother, Rev. J. P. Ellwood, to write for publication a short list of those Hindustani idioms, in which most Europeans who use Hindustani go astray, and in which, therefore, those new to the country specially need to be on their guard. That list, which was published in 1894, was found useful in many quarters; but this fact only showed the need of another publication of the same kind, but very much larger and fuller, and also free from some defects which had meanwhile become manifest. Accordingly, when I had the necessary leisure during a furlough in New Zealand in 1900, I wrote a book of 116 pages, entitled "Helps to Hindustani Idiom." That book, too, I am thankful to say, has been widely useful; but further experience has shown the want of something else on the same lines, but still larger and fuller, and at the same time free from some mistakes, which crept also into that second book. Hence the present work, which is more than double the size of the second; and which will, I hope, be accepted by my countrymen and countrywomen in India, and specially by my young brother and sister missionaries in this land, as my *last* effort in this direction; and will, I trust and pray, be accepted by my and their Master, to help forward the extension of His kingdom in India. For there can be no doubt that, as the carelessness, so sadly prevalent among Europeans, about a correct use of the vernacular is a great stumbling-block and hindrance to that unity of feeling between them and Indians which is so desirable, so on the other hand, there are few things which more tend to do away with

2068066

the barrier between them, than an evident desire on the part of the foreigner to speak to the natives of India as they speak to one another.

The first two chapters of this book are new. The first chapter, indeed, does embody some things which found their place in the *Introduction* to the second book above mentioned: but the reader will now find them, and much besides, treated in a much more comprehensive and systematic way in the body of the book itself. The second chapter is entirely new. It is only since writing the second book that I have been convinced of the necessity of giving young foreign students of the language all possible help in acquiring the *sounds* which are used in it. Of course, no printed exposition of this subject can take the place of a competent living teacher; nor can this second chapter dispense with the need of learning, from a native of the country, and by watching by eye and by ear how he pronounces the letters, the equivalents in sound to the printed letters in that chapter. Still, I am sure that if the student will carefully study this chapter, at the same time that he learns from his teachers, he will find it very helpful indeed. More than this cannot be done by print.

As I said in the Introduction to the second book, this work is neither Grammar nor Dictionary. The Elements of Hindustani Grammar are presupposed in it; and yet in the present work much more is said on this subject than before, mainly in order to impart a completeness to the whole, which it would otherwise lack. Still less is this work a Dictionary; Platts' Hindustani Dictionary will always be wanted by the foreign student, however proficient he may become: and yet a great deal will be found in the present work which is found also in that indispensable work, only more connectedly than is possible in a dictionary.

For, though the word "Idiom" disappears from the

title of this work,—it could not do otherwise, after the addition of the first two chapters,—yet the *main* aim and object of the work remains the same as at first, *viz.* to help new comers to the country to acquire the right *Idiom*, with which Indians, who are uncorrupted by contact with foreigners, speak and write Hindustani. *This* aim has been kept in view throughout; and therefore I have not been content with stating what is correct, but have also very frequently sought to guard against what is wrong.

I have now shown how experience and thought have caused the present work to grow from a small beginning; and I suppose that, *if* I were to write another edition three years hence, it would be a good deal larger still. For continually, while I was engaged in writing this work, new examples of rules, new and better ways of stating the same facts, and new modifications of statements, would occur to me; and of these, so far as possible, I kept a record, and embodied them in the work just before sending it to the press. But naturally, a great many more have occurred to me since. Of these, what seemed the most important have been inserted, by the kind indulgence of the printer, in the proofs; but of course there was a clear limit to the extent to which I could presume on that indulgence. And other facts, some of them quite important (*e.gr.* that "ḍūbnā" forms its causal more commonly by inserting *o* than *ā*), have occurred to me too late to insert in that part of the book to which they apply. Hence I beg that no reader shall assume that this book is complete, or even nearly so, in fulfilling its object. Omissions—some of them, no doubt, strangely glaring—will occur to every reader from time to time. Many of these I have collected, along with misprints, in a list of "Addenda et Corrigenda" at the end of this book; but many others will certainly not be included even there.

Nor is it only of "sins of omission" that I have

to plead guilty. It is probable that some readers will find what appear to them mis-statements in this work; or, if not actual mis-statements, yet over-statements, facts stated too generally. Of course I am not *aware* of any such, or I would not have written them; but there are such differences, even of idiom, among different classes of Indians and in different parts of the country, that I shall not be at all surprised if many of my statements are questioned and some flatly contradicted. After all, however, one person can only state what his experience has led him to believe; and all I ask my reader to concede is, that I have said nothing in this book which a tolerably long experience, and a good deal of thought over that experience, have not led me to believe true.

Two things remain to be said. One is that, while I hope many of my countrymen and women, who are not missionaries, will find this book useful, yet I have had my fellow-missionaries chiefly in mind, and therefore a very large part of the examples which I have produced are taken from those Scriptures which missionaries must make their "vade mecum" in doing their work. And my quotations have invariably been from the *last* revision of the Old Testament in Hindi, and of the New Testament in Urdu; save that, very rarely indeed, I have ventured to differ from those translations, and have given my own, and my reason for it.

The other is that, of the three scripts in which Hindustani is written, *viz.* Nāgarī, Persian, and Roman, if I had in this work adopted either the first or second, the book would have been unintelligible by nearly half of those for whom it was intended. Therefore, this work being designed for *foreigners*, and as all foreigners come to India with a knowledge of the Roman character, I have throughout employed this script.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

Of Language in General, and Hindustani in particular 1

CHAPTER II.

Of Sounds in Hindustani 20

CHAPTER III.

Gender of Nouns 36

CHAPTER IV.

Cases and Postpositions 40

CHAPTER V.

Compound Nouns 54

CHAPTER VI.

Adjectives 57

CHAPTER VII.

The adjectival affixes "kā" and "Wālā" 59

CHAPTER VIII.

Numerals 65

CHAPTER IX.

The adjectival affix "Sā" 71

CHAPTER X.

Personal Pronouns 74

CHAPTER XI.

Possessive Pronouns 80

PAGE.

CHAPTER XII.

Verbs—General Remarks 84

CHAPTER XIII.

Neuter and Causal Verbs 91

CHAPTER XIV.

Passive Verbs 98

CHAPTER XV.

Tenses of Verbs 101

CHAPTER XVI.

Certain Verbs 137

CHAPTER XVII.

Adverbs 194

CHAPTER XVIII.

Certain Conjunctions 196

CHAPTER XIX.

How to render "as" and "or" 208

CHAPTER XX.

The Particle "Hãñ" 210

CHAPTER XXI.

The Particle "Hi" 213

CHAPTER XXII.

The Particle "Bhī" 219

CHAPTER XXIII.

The Particle "To" 224

CHAPTER XXIV.

Correspondent Words 232

PAGE.

CHAPTER XXV.

Interrogative Words and Sentences 237

CHAPTER XXVI.

Relative Words and Clauses 243

CHAPTER XXVII.

Indefinite Words 254

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Negative Words and Clauses 257

CHAPTER XXIX.

The word "Whether" 264

CHAPTER XXX.

The words "Enough" and "too" and "too much" 265

CHAPTER XXXI.

Interjections 268

CHAPTER XXXII.

The Conjunction "For" 270

CHAPTER XXXIII.

The words "Āge" and "Pīchhe" 271

CHAPTER XXXIV.

Accuracy and Perspicuity 274

CHAPTER XXXV.

Insertion and Omission 277

CHAPTER XXXVI.

Emphasis 283

CHAPTER XXXVII.

Apposition 285

PAGE.

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

Quotation 287

CHAPTER XXXIX.

Reduplication 290

CHAPTER XL.

Some wrong Idioms 296

CHAPTER XLI.

An Example to be Avoided 304

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.

Page 7, line 16. *For* "way" *read* "may."

Page 8, line 12. *For* "water" *read* "water."

Page 9, line 15. *For* "it" *read* "is."

Page 21, line 30. *For* "lip of the tongue" *read* "tip of the tongue."

Page 21, line 33. *Omit* "three."

Page 21, footnote. *For* "called Ain," *read* "called in Arabic and Urdu ʿAin."

Page 22, line 4. *For* "Sh" *read* "Sh."

Page 31, line 30. *For the second* "Sibboleth" *read* "Shibboleth."

Page 32, line 6. *For* "dental" *read* "dentals."

Page 33, line 10. Add "different" before "consonants."

Page 37, line 30. *For* "rūh" *read* "rūh."

Page 39, line 29. *Omit* bracket before "elephant."

Page 46. Before the first line *add:* We say "it is some time *to*, or *before*, ten o'clock"; but they say "das bajne *men* der hai."

Page 48, line 26. *For* "they" *read* "he."

Page 50, line 16. *For* "xiv" *read* "xiii."

Page 50, line 17. *For the first* "xiii" *read* "xiv."

Page 54. *Add* to para 23, after "past tenses," this sentence: In the Panjab a construction is still in vogue which comes straight from the Sanskrit use of the agentive case, and is really more correct than the idiom which obtains in Hindustan. *E.gr.* "Āp *ne* āj tīn kām karne hain," "you have to do three things to-day" (lit. "*by* you to-day three works are to be done;" where a Hindustani would say. "Āp *ko* āj tīn kām karne hain," lit. "*for* you three works are to be done."

Page 59, line 5. After "illiterate" *add:* and even "jāsti," a corruption of "ziyādatī," an abstract noun derived from "ziyāda."

Page 64. *Add* another paragraph at the bottom, *viz.:* 10. Hindi has a substitute for "wālā," but *only with infinitives.* It is "hārā," or "hār." This may be used for any of the four reasons

(see para. 6 of this chapter) for attaching "wālā" to an infinitive. In the form "hār," it is chiefly met with in the word "honhār," "the future," which means the same as "honewālā," lit. "what is about to take place." Probably these affixes are derived from the Sanskrit "dhār," in the sense of "holding." Thus, "Jānchārā" meant, originally, "one who holds a going in his mind, or in his destiny."

Page 68, line 14. *For* "or" *read* "so."

Page 70, line 24. *For* "dūsre" *read* "dūsrā."

Page 70. After para 10, add another paragraph, *viz.*, 11. It is difficult for foreigners at first to get into the way of saying "derh" for "1½," and "dhāi" (in the East "arhāi") for "2½." But though an Indian will *understand* "sāṛhā ek" and "sāṛhe do," his mind will dwell on the fact that the speaker is a *foreigner*.

Page 85, line 18. *For* "sitting in" *read* "settling into."

Page 87, line 9. *For* "is come" *read* "he is come."

Page 91. After the last para. of Chapter XII, *add* this new paragraph: 6. Hindustani is in the happy position of having *very few irregular verbs*; and those few are irregular only in (1) the past participle and the tenses derived therefrom; (2) the Imperative Form 2; and (3) the causal formations. They are "huā" and "hūjiye" from "honā;" "kiyā" and "kījiye" from "karnā" (though "karā" *is also* used); "diyā and dījiye" from "denā;" "liyā" and "lijiye" from "lenā;" "gayā" from "jānā" (see page 144); "mūā," as alternative with "marā," from "marnā." For irregular Causals, see page 17, and also the note next following this.

Page 97. After the last para. of Chapter XIII, *add* this new paragraph: "Dūbnā," "to sink" (oneself in a liquid), and "Bhingnā," "to get wet or damp," make their causals "dubonā" preferably to "dubānā," and "bhigonā" alternatively with "bhigānā."

Page 102, line 20. *For* "superlative" *read* "Imperative."

Page 111, *omit* lines 1 to 4, from "There" to "gayā."

Page 111, line 5. *For* "2" *read* "2, 2."

Page 111, line 9. *For* "2, 4" *read* "2, 5."

Page 112, after the end of the first para. *add*: In all such cases, the verb *looks* as if it were in the simple past; but really it is in the perfect.

Page 114, line 28. After "action" *add* "or condition."

Page 122, line 6. *For* "12" *read* "2."

Page 123, lines 9 to 13. *Omit* from "There" to "hūjiye."

Page 124. After the end of the first para. add this new paragraph: 4. There is also a plural form of this kind of Imperative,

ending in "iyo," *e.gr.*, "āiyo," "come." It is used to connote affectionate tenderness.

Page 131, line 7. *For* "aparadhi" *read* "aparādhī."

Page 131, line 14. *For* "āshish" *read* "āshīsh."

Page 133, line 21. *For* "conjuctive" *read* "conjunctive."

Page 144, line 19. *For* "and simple past" *read* "and the tenses derived therefrom."

Page 145, line 2. *For* "XIV" *read* "XII, 3, 3."

Page 152, line 16. *For* "causes" *read* "caused."

Page 158, line 6. *For* "11 (2)" *read* "14."

Page 160, line 29. *For* "tense" *read* "sense."

Page 163. After the second para. add this new paragraph: When "chāhnā" takes the other verb in the Infinitive form I (see Chapter XV, 12), it often acquires the meaning, not of wishing, but of *being about* to do, or suffer, something; *e.gr.* "wah marā chāhtā hai," "he is about to die;" "āth bajā chāhte haiñ," "it is just going to strike eight."

Page 163, line 29. *For* "11 (2)" *read* "14."

Page 168 line 30. *For* "6" *read* "8."

Page 169, line 27. *For* "means" *read* "mean."

Page 175, line 14. *For* "5" *read* "5, 5."

Page 178, line 13. *For* "āshish" *read* "āshīsh."

Page 191, line 13. *For* "to send *by* some one," *read* "to say *by* some one.

Page 191, line 23. *For* "sikhāi" *read* "samjhāi."

Page 192. After para. 13, *add* these two new paragraphs: 14. "Khulnā," and its causal "kholnā," are used *both* in the sense of "opening" (intransitive and transitive) and *also* in that of "being loosed" and "loosing." Hence "Ephphatha" (Mark 7: 34, 35), which means both "Be opened" and "be loosed," can be exactly rendered in Hindustani by "khul ja," referring both to the opening of the ears and to the loosing of the tongue; whereas in English, as in Greek, only one of these meanings is possible at once.

15. "Pahinnā" and "orhnā" (with their causals "pahināna" and "orhānā) both mean "to put on" (a garment), but the difference between them—which must never be ignored in speaking Hindustani—is that the former means to put on a garment which is made to fit the body, or a part of it; whereas the latter is the word for putting on a shawl, a blanket, or any other garment which is *not* made to fit.

Page 208, line 27. *For* "upar" *read* "upar."

Page 216, line 15. *For* "him bestow a *blessing*" *read* "(him) bestow a *blessing* on them."

Page 224, second line of footnote. *For* "II, 3, (4) (*a*)," *read* "II, 7 (4) (*a*).".

Page 228, line 2. *For* "you" *read* "thee."

Page 229, line 26. *For* "tho" *read* "the."

Page 232, in the sixth column. Below "titnā" add "taī;" below "kitnā" *add* "kaī;" below "jitnā," *add* "jaī."

Page 241, line 2. *For* "question" *read* "questions."

Page 252, line 9. *For* "belong of" *read* "belong to."

Page 269, line 20. After the end of para. 4, *add* (in the same paragraph): A good instance is Ps. 137: 3 and 4. The request of the captivators, Sing us one of the songs of Zion, would in Hindustani be met by an "are" before the rejoinder, "How shall we sing Jehovah's song in the foreigner's land?"

Page 276, line 19. Delete "the" between "taken" and "literally."

Page 277. After the end of the first para. *add* this new paragraph: (5) We call the rays of the sun "the sun," *e.gr.* "the sun will come out soon," "I will go and sit in the sun," etc. But in all such cases, where the actual sun itself is not meant, "dhūp" (sunshine) must be used. Similarly, wherever "the moon" means only "moonlight," "chāndnī" must be used.

Page 284, at the bottom, *add* this new paragraph: 4. In this chapter we have dealt with emphasis *on words in a sentence*, not on *syllables in a word*. But with regard to the latter, it may be as well to say that (1) there is not nearly the difference in Hindustani, between emphatic and non-emphatic syllables, that there is in English and German; (2) yet they are mistaken who assert that Hindustani makes *no* such difference; and (3) while there is no general rule as to which syllables should be accented and which not, yet it may be stated here that, in a great number of cases, words of Persian origin are accented on the *last* syllable, *e.gr.* "bīmār," "afsos," "durust," etc.; whereas words of Indian origin generally have the accent on some other syllable, *e.gr.*, "āgyā." "dewatā," "aushadh."

Yet of course, there are numbers of exceptions on both sides. And often different forms of the same verb are distinguished only by the difference of accent; *e.gr.* "bánā," is the past participle of "banná," but "banā" is the imperative of "banānā."

Page 292. At the end of the first para. *add* these words: Strictly speaking, when the reduplication of an adjective conveys the plurality of the noun to which it is attached, neither the adjective nor the noun should be put in the plural number, because this is unnecessary. Yet idiom requires that they *be* put in the plural: *e.gr.* "achchhe achchhe ghore," "good horses;" "bare bare patthar," "big stones;" "chhoṭi chhoṭi chiṭṭhiyāñ," "small letters."

Page 294, line 20. *For* "son" *read* "sun."

CHAPTER I.

Of Language in General, and Hindustani in Particular.

1. Language consists of four things, viz. :—

(1) *Sounds* uttered by the human voice.

N.B.—Not "letters" in the sense of written characters, for (*a*) many languages are unwritten, and yet are as truly languages as written ones are; and (*b*) any language can be written in any set of characters, though some are more suitable to some languages, and others to others.

(2) *Vocabulary, i.e.*, sounds, or combinations of sounds, called "words," which convey some definite idea to the speaker and hearer.

Language

(3) *Etymology, i.e.*, modifications of words because of either (*a*) their derivation from other words, or (*b*) the relation in which they stand to other words.

(4) *Syntax, i.e.*, formation of sentences by putting words together in certain ways.

2. Idiom is the peculiarity of any language in respect of (*a*) the use of words, *i.e.*, the meaning attached to them; (*b*) the meaning attached to modifications of words; (*c*) above all, syntax. But Idiom appeals only to foreigners, *i.e.*, those who learn a language other than their mother-tongue, after their childhood. To no one does any idiom of his mother-tongue seem peculiar, because he has

Idiom

always been accustomed to it. It is for this reason that, *e.gr.* as a rule, foreigners who have studied Hindustani are more alive to its idioms than natives of Hindustan are.

3. Of so-called PARTS OF SPEECH—

Parts of Speech

(1) *Interjections* are the least human, being simply expressions of feeling, like the various noises made by different kinds of animals (neighing, lowing, purring, barking, etc.).

(2) *Proper Nouns* are the next least human, because they require no mental abstraction, being names of individual persons or things, like chalk marks affixed to things; and this is why they are often difficult to remember.

(3) *Common Nouns*, and *Adjectives*, are very human, because they express the product of abstraction, *i.e.*, the mental extraction of one quality from a number of objects which have that quality in common, and the leaving out of sight their other qualities, *e gr.* box, white.

(4) *Verbs* are the most human of all, being most dependent on abstraction. Verbs are words *par excellence*; "verb" comes from the Latin "verbum," a word. Certainly most of the "roots" of languages, and perhaps all of them, are verbs. Most verbal roots are of unknown origin; but some are "onomato-poetic," *i.e.* imitations of sounds, *e gr.* "hiss," "spit."

(5) *Adverbs* bear the same relation to verbs as adjectives do to nouns, *i.e.*, they express certain qualities of the action denoted by the verb, as adjectives do to those of the object denoted by the noun. Hence in some languages (*e.gr.* in German) there is no difference in form between adjectives and adverbs: which is the case in some instances in English, *e.gr.*, to "walk fast," not "fastly."

(6) *Conjunctions* indicate the relation of some clauses, or sentences, to others.

(7) *Prepositions* and *postpositions* show the relation of some words to other words. They are all originally nouns, which in a more or less modified form have been attached to other nouns to express certain relations. Often the same word is, in different connections, an adverb, a conjunction, or a preposition. *E.gr.*, in "go on before," "before" is an adverb, qualifying the verb "go on;" in "before they call," it is a conjunction, showing the relation of this clause to another; and in "stand before me," it is a preposition, indicating the relation of "stand" to "me."

(8) *Pronouns* are generally treated as a separate part of speech; but they are all either nouns or adjectives.

4. Living languages—*i.e.* those which are spoken as vernaculars, not only by learned persons—always exhibit two TENDENCIES. One of these is the tendency to *develop*, *i.e.*, to alter, in any or all of the four constituent parts of language mentioned in the first paragraph. This development is often spoken of as "corruption;" *e.gr.*, people call the Hindi for "tiger," "bāgh," a corruption of the Sanskrit "vyāghra." But it is not corruption; it is neither advance nor retrogression; it is merely alteration according to the changing genius, or environment, of the people speaking the language in question. The other tendency is to *divide and subdivide*. That is, people originally speaking the same language develop it differently; those living in one part, and having constant intercourse with one another, develop it in one way; and those living in another part, and only rarely meeting the former, develop it in another way. Hence arise (1) different languages from the same stock, and (2) different dialects of the same language. There is no hard and fast division between a language

Tendencies of Language

and a dialect; but in a general way it may be said that ordinary people, speaking one dialect of a language, understand another dialect of the same language, but not a different language.

5. Both the above tendencies are retarded, or even arrested, by two things. *viz.*,—

Checks to Tendencies

(1) *Education;* for the children of a nation are not educated each in his own dialect, but in the same dialect.

(2) *Literature;* for while most languages have some dialectic literature, most of their literature is perforce in some one dialect of each language.

And the same cause that arrests the tendency to division, equally and for the same reason arrests the tendency to development; or at least very largely retards it.

6. It is often quite accidental, *which* dialect of a language gains the mastery over the others, and becomes the "standard" dialect of literature and education. That is, this is not decided by the intrinsic superiority of one dialect over the others, but by historical causes. *E.gr.* Standard English, the English of literature and of educated people, was originally the dialect of the East Midlands, and prevailed because London, and the two ancient universities, were in that region. Before the Norman conquest, however, the Wessex dialect of Anglo-Saxon was the standard, owing to the fact that Wessex was, politically, the premier division of England. Similarly, as we shall see later, the literary and polite form of Hindustani is the dialect of the part where the Muhammadan conquerors established their capital.

Dialects

7. DEVELOPMENT of language takes place in two ways.

(1) By *incorporating foreign words* into its vocabulary. This takes place in two stages. (*a*) First, the foreign word is the property only of the more or less learned, who write it, and try (more or less successfully) to pronounce it, as it is written and pronounced by the foreigners whose native word it is. In English, words in this stage are printed in italics. (*b*) When the foreign word is accepted by the mass of the people into whose language it has come, so that it has become a word of that language, it is almost invariably altered, both in spelling and in pronunciation, according to the genius of that language. This law is very conspicuous in English, which has incorporated into itself thousands of French words; and in Hindustani, whose vocabulary consists very largely of Arabic and Persian, and now ever-increasingly of English, words. But be it always remembered, that no amount of incorporation of foreign vocabulary alters the essence of a language; which consists of the Etymology, the Pronouns, and the Numerals. As long as a language does not largely adopt any of these three elements from foreigners, it remains the same language, however many other words it receives from them.

Development of Vocabulary

(2) By changes in the *method of expressing the relation of words to one another*. These changes produce new languages, rather than new phases of the same language. As far as can be ascertained, language passes through *four stages;* but not all languages have yet passed through all four; on the contrary, some are still in the first stage.

Stages of Language

(*a*) *Juxtapositional, i.e.*, where monosyllabic words are put, unmodified, side by side; the position being the only thing to show either the kind of connexion between the words, or the "part of speech" to which each belongs. Such is the Chinese language.

(*b*) *Agglutinative*, where some words, which by themselves have no meaning, or have lost the meaning they once had, are "glued on" to other words, to indicate what relation these latter words bear to yet others; both these latter words having meanings of their own. Such a language is Turkish.

(*c*) *Synthetical*, where the meaningless words just referred to are *absorbed into* the words to which they were once glued, and remain in them as *terminations*, or other modifications, of those words, and so produce "Etymology." Such are all the ancient languages which we call classical, *e.gr.* Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin. Such also, to a great extent, are many modern languages, *e.gr.*, German and Persian. Such are, again, to some small extent, languages which on the whole are analytical. *E.gr.* in English, the terminations *s* of the plural, and *'s* of the genitive, are relics of Anglo-Saxon, which was a synthetical language.

(*d*) *Analytical*, where the terminations, and other modifications, are dropped, and their place supplied by other words; not now meaningless as in agglutinative languages, but each having a meaning of its own. Most modern languages are mostly of this kind. In them, cases are superseded by prepositions or (as in Hindustani) postpositions; tenses by "auxiliary" verbs, and so on. Yet, as has just been observed in the case of English, few, if any, modern languages are altogether analytical. *E.gr.*, in English, it is only habit which makes us say "I" before "am," seeing that "am" occurs only in the first person singular. And in Hindustani, the pronoun is never used, except for special emphasis, with the second person plural imperative; seeing that "jāo" can only mean "go *you*," and ordinarily requires no "tum."

8. Languages are divided into FAMILIES. The families of languages which concern Hindustani are

(1) *Aryan, essentially,* (2) *Shemitic, accidentally, i.e.*, because of the conquest of Hindustan by tribes which had already, by reason of their conversion to Islam, incorporated many Arabic words into their own languages.

Families of Language

9. "Ārya" is a Sanskrit word, meaning "noble." It was applied by the ancestors of those now called Hindus to themselves, as distinguished from the aborigines whom they found in India, and conquered. But many learned etymologists think that the word is connected with the Latin for "to plow" (whence our "arable"), and was adopted because they were specially addicted to the cultivation of the soil, whereas the aborigines got their living by less civilised methods, such as hunting. However this way be, modern scholars have extended the word to all those languages, of which Sanskrit is the premier specimen.

Aryan

The Aryan family consists of several groups, of which the principal are Celtic, Scandinavian, Teutonic, Slavonian, and the so-called "Southern," which includes Sanskrit, Persian, Greek, and Latin. Ancient Persian is but little known, but that little shows it to have been a twin-sister of Sanskrit. Modern Persian (apart from the Arabic vocabulary which it has incorporated) is very much simpler than ancient; and this is the probable reason why many of its words have ousted, in Hindustani and cognate Indian languages, the native words derived from Sanskrit. *E.gr.*, "tez" ("sharp") has taken the place of "tīkshna," with which it is cognate; "garm" ("warm") has superseded "ushna;" in both cases because the Persian word is easier to pronounce than the native one. In many cases, the old Sanskrit word, having been displaced in India by a quite different word, has returned to India

Influence of Persian

in its Persian, simplified, form. *E.gr.*, the Sanskrit for "white" is "shweta;" the native modern word is "ujlā;" but the old word has come back in the form of the Persian "safed." So, one Sanskrit word for "ass" is "khar;" but the word, having been lost in India, has returned to it in the form of the Persian "khar," in such compounds as "khargosh" ("a hare," lit. "ass-eared") and "kharbūz" ("a musk-melon"). Again, one of the almost innumerable Sanskrit words for "water" is "ap." This has long been quite lost in India, but it has returned in the form of the Persian "āb," as in the phrase "āb o hawā," "water" and air," *i.e.*, "climate," and in the compounds "Panjāb," "Doāb," etc. Once more, the Sanskrit "antar," "inside," has disappeared from the common language (though retained among the learned), but has reappeared as the Persian "andar," "within." In some cases, an idea of decency has (as in all languages) led to the adoption of the foreign rather than the native word; *e.gr.*, the Sanskrit for "tail" is "puchchha," from which is derived the Hindustani "pūnchh;" yet the Persian "dum" is more commonly used. Lastly, in many cases the Sanskrit and the Persian words are identical; *e.gr.* "dūr," "far." Those who know Persian but not Sanskrit think that such words have come into Hindustani from Persian; but they are mistaken.

Sanskrit

10. Sanskrit represents, generally speaking, the oldest known form of that Aryan speech which was in the remote, pre-historic past the common tongue of the whole Aryan family. There are, indeed, some clear exceptions to this; *e.gr.* the word for "star" has an *s* before the *t* in most of the other groups, including the other members of the "Southern" group (Persian, Greek, and Latin), but in the Sanskrit word (tārā) it has no "s"; and it is incredible that all the other languages should have added

an "s," rather than that Sanskrit has lost it. Still, on the whole, in Sanskrit we come much nearer to the original Aryan speech than in any other language.

Indian Vernaculars

It is, indeed, uncertain how far Sanskrit, as we know it in ancient Indian literature, was ever really the vernacular of a people. The extreme complexity of its etymology, which far exceeds that of Greek and Latin, inclines one to think that, at least in the form in which we know it, it was the speech of the learned rather than of the simple. And this opinion is confirmed by the literal meaning of the word; for "Sanskrit" means "perfected," which seems to imply artificial manipulation rather than natural development. *Yet* Sanskrit it the parent, or ancestor, of all North Indian languages except some aboriginal tongues spoken in the Vindhya range; also of Mahrāṭhī on the west of India and of Singhala (called by English people "Singhalese") in Ceylon. In the Peninsula of India, the languages, other than Mahrāṭhī, are non-Aryan, and are called "Dravidian." The principal of them are four, *viz.*, Telugu, Tamil, Kanarese, and Malayālim. These languages, when those who spoke them embraced Hinduism, received an immense number of Sanskrit words, which they have preserved in purer form than the Aryan vernaculars have; but essentially (*i.e.*, in grammar, pronouns, and numerals) they belong to an entirely different family.

Prākrit

11. In process of time, Sanskrit branched out into several different languages, as Latin did into Italian, Spanish, French, etc. These are called "Prākrit," which literally means "natural." Some of the Prākrits are preserved in literature, where they appear as the speech of women folk, and of the unlearned generally. One Prākrit, named Māgadhī, being at one time the vernacular of

Bihār, where Gautama became Buddha, was taken to Ceylon, under the name of Pālī, and there became as truly the sacred language of Buddhism as Sanskrit is of Hinduism.

Historically, the Prākrits came between Sanskrit and the modern Aryan languages of India. Yet it would be only partly true to say that these languages were evolved out of the Prākrits. In many respects they are so; but in others they show clearly an evolution of their own, independent of any Prākrit (at least) which we know. (*E.gr.* "e" and "o" are recognized only as long vowels, in the vernaculars as in Sanskrit; but in the Prākrits they are short as well as long. And Prākrit delights in eliding consonants between two vowels in Sanskrit words, thus leaving the two vowels with nothing between them; a thing which the vernaculars, in almost all cases, consistently avoid.) But of the formation of these modern languages we know next to nothing. In Europe, we can trace the gradual development more or less continuously of the modern languages (*e.gr.* English and the Romance languages); but in India there is an entire absence of data from the 1st to the 9th century A.D. *Then* the modern Aryan languages appear, here and there, like chickens coming out of eggs.

Evolution of Vernaculars

12. There is a convenient division, made by Pandits, of the words in these languages into three classes, *viz.* *Tatsama*, *Tadbhava*, and *Deshaja*. The third class consists of words which are not derived from Sanskrit, but have come in from the tongue of the aborigines whom the Aryans conquered. But the existence of this class is very doubtful indeed. Most of the words, once supposed to be aboriginal, have been proved to be remotely derived from Sanskrit. Still, it would be rash altogether to deny the existence

Three kinds of Words

of such words. Of the other two classes, *Tatsama* words are those which are pure Sanskrit, unchanged in any way; and *Tadbhava* are those which are derived from Sanskrit, but (as explained above) are more or less altered from the Sanskrit words. *Tatsama* words owe their existence in the modern languages to two causes. Some of them have been resuscitated by scholars; and of these, some have, from extrinsic causes, become quite common, *e.gr.* "swadesh" ("own country"), which was at first only a Pandits' term, has become the battle cry of all Indians who wish India to be self-governing. Other *Tatsama* words have been preserved in the vernacular because of their simplicity; *e.gr.* "din" ("day"), "dūr" ("far").

Formation of Vernaculars

13. These modern Aryan languages appear, so far as we can trace their origins, to have formed themselves round certain nuclei in different parts of the country. *Where* any particular nucleus should be, and how far around the nucleus the people's language should adhere to that nucleus rather than to another, seems to have been determined partly by geographical, partly by political causes. (As examples of geographical causes may be mentioned (*a*) the land of the Five Rivers; (*b*) the land of the Indus alone; (*c*) the land of the Ganges where it receives tributaries, but does not branch out, (*d*) the land of the Delta of the Ganges.) This process of individualisation of the different languages must have been very gradual; as we see in the cases of Panjabi and Hindustani, the very names of which being originally Persian, cannot have existed before the Muhammadan conquest.

14. Coming now to the classification of the modern Aryan languages of India, and dismissing Singhala as

too remote to be taken into consideration for our present purpose, we find that the principal of such languages are *nine*. Of these, one is northern, *viz.*, *Kashmīrī*; one southern, *viz.*, *Mahrāṭhī*, three western, *viz.*, *Panjābī*, *Sindhī*, and *Gujarātī*, three eastern, *viz.*, *Assamese*, *Bengali*, and *Uṛiyā* (the tongue of Orissa); and *one central*, *viz.*, *Hindustānī*. This seems, on the whole, to be the most normal one of the nine, *i.e.*, it retains most of the elements of their ancestor, Sanskrit. Apparently it is the oldest of the nine; and certainly it is the most widely spoken of them, so that it may, far more than any other vernacular, claim to be the "lingua franca" of India. Also it contains more *Tadbhava* words than do any of the others.

Nine Aryan Vernaculars

15. Hindustani is the language of "Hindustan." This term is generally used by Europeans as synonymous with "India," but the natives of the country mean by it only the region mentioned above, the basin of the Ganges and its tributaries above where it branches out. The limitation of the term to this region is a curious historical fact, for "Hindu" is, originally, the Persian form of "Sindhu," the river of Sindh, which we learned from the Greeks to call the Indus. Now Sindh is the part of India which was first invaded by the Muhammadans; and they seem to have extended the name "Hindu" to all the peoples on the east side of that river. Why then, did "Hindustan" (*i.e.* the land of Hindus) come to be the name of the particular region above described? Because, though the Vedas were probably composed in the Panjab, yet for ages prior to the Muhammadan invasion *this* region had been the hearth of the nation which now calls itself by the name "Hindu," which it learnt from its conquerors. The scenes of the two great Indian epics, the Mahābhārata and the

Hindustan

Rāmāyana, are laid in *this* region; and here the religion, now called Hinduism, has always flourished as its principal seat. No wonder, then, that the name "Hindustan" became attached to it; and that the language spoken in it became known as "Hindustānī."

Not Greek but Persian

16. Considering the length of time in which Greek influence prevailed in North India after Alexander's invasion of the Panjab, it is remarkable that no influence of the Greek language over the vernaculars of India can be found. Far different, however, is the effect on them produced by the Muhammadan conquerors; who, because they came from the same quarter as the Greeks had come from centuries before, were at first supposed by the natives of India to be Greeks; and hence they are to this day called in Sanskrit Yavanas; whence the name "Jawanpur" or "Jaunpur" of a place where the Muhammadans established themselves strongly. Now these conquerors spoke Persian; but Persian had already, when the Persian people were almost wholly converted to Islam, been flooded with an Arabic vocabulary, while maintaining all the essential elements of an Aryan language. Similarly, when they introduced this Arabized Persian into India, the languages of India remained essentially what they had been before, *i.e.* Aryan; but their vocabularies were greatly enriched by a number of both Arabic and Persian words.

Formation of Urdu

17. Confining our attention, now, to Hindustani; the fact that the conquerors established themselves—as distinct from raiding—in and about Delhi, which is ethnologically and linguistically (though not now politically) in Hindustan, brought it about, that Hindustani has been more modified by this Persian influence than have the other vernaculars. For

two centuries, indeed, the conquerors spoke Persian; just as Norman-French was the court language for two centuries after the Norman conquest. And as, after those two centuries, the English language, on again becoming the language of the country, emerged with its vocabulary vastly enriched by Norman-French words, so did Hindustani emerge with a multitude of Arabic and Persian words embedded in it. Indeed, this process began early in those two centuries. First, the camp-followers, in order to make themselves understood by the Muhammadan soldiers, learnt a number of Arabic and Persian words, and incorporated them into their own speech. The dialect or form of Hindustani, thus produced, came to be known by the name "Urdu," which is the Turkish for "army," or "camp."

Dialects of Hindustani

18. As above observed, all languages tend to branch out into a number of dialects; and this process continues until it is checked by literature and education. And the larger the area in which a language is spoken, the greater, naturally, are the number of its dialects. Hence, if even in a small country like England there are still a great number of local dialects, it is not surprising that in the vastly larger area called Hindustan the dialects are much more numerous. Indeed, the village dialects change every few miles from East to West, and from North to South; though, as we shall see, education and literature are now exercising a powerful counter-tendency to this. But apart from, and over-ruling, these numberless dialects, there is one much more radical division, *viz.* between the North-west and the South-east, or simply, as the natives express it, between the West and the East. The dialectic differences we are *now* speaking of affect very slightly,

if at all, the vocabulary used; they are differences in Etymology, in the conjugation of verbs, and the declension of nouns and pronouns, and so on. In *these* respects, there is a very marked distinction between the Western and the Eastern Hindustani. The former approximates more to Panjabi, the latter to Bengali. The line of demarcation passes through the regions of Lucknow and Cawnpore; though of course it is not meant that it is anywhere quite hard and fast. The line would be everywhere at least a few miles wide.

What is Urdu?

19. Now, when Urdu was formed, as above explained, it was of course not all the dialects of Hindustani that took into themselves the foreign vocabulary, but *only one, viz.* the dialect which was spoken in and around Delhi. Hence Urdu differs in *two* ways from other forms of Hindustani; it is one particular dialect of it, and it has also flooded that dialect with Arabic and Persian words. But, having establised itself in and near the conquerors' capital, it spread with their conquests; and so, being the form of Hindustani alone used by them, it became the fashionable form in the whole of Hindustan. This includes two things, *viz.* that it was the form of Hindustani used by the rulers themselves, and their subordinates, in the government of the country; and that it was taken up largely by their subjects as the vehicle of literature and public utterance.

Only Nouns and Adjectives

Yet there is a great difference between Urdu, and the form which English acquired as the result of the Norman conquest. In the latter, *all* parts of speech (except pronouns and numerals) were equally influenced by the foreign element introduced; we have, *e.gr.* quite as many verbs which have come to us through French from Latin, as

we have nouns and adjectives. But in Urdu, the reverse is the case. There are only four verbal roots in Urdu, which come from Arabic or Persian; *all others* are native Indian, *i.e.* they are derived from Sanskrit. The vocabulary, with which Urdu is enriched from Arabic and Persian sources, is almost wholly confined to nouns and adjectives (conjunctions and prepositions *are* originally nouns, as we shall see later). Hence, Urdu is *more* true to its Indian source than English is to its Teutonic source.

What, now, are the nouns and adjectives which Urdu has borrowed from Arabic and Persian? They may be divided into four classes; though (*a*) some words of each of the classes are not foreign but native, and (*b*) some words outside these classes are of foreign origin. The four are: (1) *legal* words; yet such an important word for legal purposes as that of a court of justice is not foreign but native, *viz. Kachahrī*. (2) *military* and *police* words; yet such a necessary military weapon as a sword is called by a native Indian name, *viz., talwār*. (3) *equestrian* words; yet the native Indian "ghoṛā" for "horse" and "bāg" for "rein" have always kept their place rather than the Persian words for the same. (4) most of all, *religious* and *theological* terms. Religion is, after all, what stirs, and maintains its hold on, man's heart more than anything else; and if the conquerors of India had had the same religion as the conquered (as the Normans' religion was the same as the Saxons'), or one less violently opposed to it than Islam is to Hinduism, no doubt the three other differences of Urdu from other Hindustani would long ago have vanished. If the Normans and Saxons had continued to this day to hold different religions, there would be two forms of English, the Normanic and the Saxonic. The language would be the same, *viz.* English; but the two communities

Of four Kinds.

would be using two forms of it. This will help us to understand why there are still two forms of Hindustani, the Urdu and the non-Urdu.

Absorption of Foreign Words

Yet the influence of Arabic and Persian upon Hindustani is by no means confined to religous terms, as we have seen. Indeed, there are some Arabic or Persian words which have actually displaced the corresponding native words; and these, of course, are non-religious. *E.gr.* "muqaddama" (a lawsuit), "ḥākim" (a ruler, in general), and "sandūq" (a box) are the only words in use, in their several meanings, among ordinary people. But all such words, when spoken by ordinary people, are modified according to the genius of native Hindustani. Thus "muqaddama" is pronounced "mukaddamā;" "ḥākim," "hākim;" and "sandūq," "sandūk." And there are other words which present the curious phenomenon of the foreign word having been adopted by the common people in place of the native word; which native word is preferred in Urdu! *E.gr.*, all ordinary Hindustanis use, for "fever," the Arabic word "bukhār," which properly means "mist;" whereas the Urdu for "fever" is "tap," which is the Sanskrit word hardly altered. Again, for "for" in the sense of "for the sake of" or "with the object of," while Urdu prefers the native word "liye," the mass of the people only say "wāste," which is the Arabic for "medium," *viz.* "wāsta," with the Hindustani change of the final "a" into "e." And now, as already mentioned, English words are being daily more and more incorporated into Hindustani; some unmodified, as "jaj" for "judge"; others modified, as "Gendail" for "General"; "Kānshans" for "conscience," etc.

20. This is the best place to mention that there are two principal Persian *idioms* which are considered

good Urdu, but the tendency is now to minimize their use. One is the use of "i" (or "ĕ" as it is often written), which is called the "izāfat," and in Persian (*a*) connects a noun with another noun which *would* be in the genitive case in a language which had cases; *e.gr.* "mard i Khudā," "man of God," "tā dam i marg," "even to breath of death," *i.e.* "dying breath"; and (*b*) connects a noun with its qualifying adjective. But this second use has *not* come into Urdu. The second Persian idiom is the use of "o" ("and") between couples, but *only* (in Urdu), between couples which naturally form pairs; *e.gr.* "nek o bad," "good and evil" "āsmān o zamīn," "heaven and earth."

Two Persian Idioms

21. We have now explained what is meant by "Hindustani," and by "Urdu." But what is "Hindi?" By its derivation, the word ought to mean the same as "Hindustani." For when the Muhammadan conquerors, who had applied the term "Hindu" to all dwellers on the east of the Indus, confined the word "Hindustan" (*i.e.* Hindu land) specially to the basin of the Ganges above the Delta, they formed the word "Hind" also, and gave it the special meaning of "Hindustan," as well as the general one of what we call "India." And, as matter of fact, Bengalis, in their own country, use the term "Hindi" in exactly the same sense as Hindustanis use the word "Hindustani."

What is Hindi

Yet, in Hindustan, the word "Hindi" has come to mean a form of Hindustani different from Urdu. And in this sense it has two quite different meanings. Sometimes it is used to denote all the different dialects of Hindustani, *other than* the one adopted by Urdu, and which, as we have seen, differ from it in Etymology. In this sense, it would be impossible for

Difference from Urdu

any one person, whether native or foreign, to acquire Hindi so as to use it freely in conversation; the utmost that a foreigner can attempt is the dialect of the district in which he lives and works, in addition to that which Urdu has made the standard one.

But the more common use of the term "Hindi," in these days, is to denote an artificial form of Hindustani which was composed by Pandits about a century ago, and which (with few exceptions) preserves the dialect which Urdu has spread throughout Hindustan, but substitutes words of Sanskrit origin (for the most part, Tatsamas) for words originally Arabic or Persian. In other words, the *Grammar* of the Hindi found in prose literature, and used in public utterances, is the same (with few exceptions) as that of Urdu; but its *Vocabulary* is largely different. And this difference, as already hinted, is mainly one of religious terminology.

Artificial Hindi

22. The "few exceptions" above alluded to are really due rather to geographical difference than to any distinction between Urdu and Hindi. We have already spoken of north-western and south-eastern Hindustani as very different from each other. That difference, however, refers only to the spoken dialects of the illiterate; but apart from this, even in the literary form which is called Urdu or (in the second sense) Hindi, there are some differences which, owing to the fact that Urdu is more widely spread in the north-west than in the south-east, *seem* to be differences between Urdu and Hindi, whereas they are really differences between the north-west and the south-east. Such are (1) the use of "yih" and "wuh" in the north-west for "proximate" and "remote" pronouns, while in the south-east "yah" and "wah" are used; (2) the fact that these pronouns form, in the plural, respectively "ye" and "we" in the south-east,

Local Differences

whereas in the north-west the plural is the same as the singular; (3) the use of "hāñ" in the north-west in the sense of the French "chez," while in the south-east "yahāñ" is wrongly used in the same sense [see chap. 20, 6 and 24, 3 (2)]. (4) the fact that the first-person pronoun singular is "maiñ" in the north-west, whereas the south-easterner calls himself "ham," which is only plural in the north-west. (5) the fact that many nouns have opposite genders in these two parts of Hindustan [see chap. 3, 1]; (6) several other differences, some of which will appear in the sequel.

CHAPTER II.

Of Sounds in Hindustani.

Limited in Number

The different sounds, of which the human voice is capable, are practically innumerable; but those which are used in Hindustani, though numerous, can all be acquired with some effort. Indeed, only a few of them are unfamiliar to speakers of English.

Ghosh and Aghosh

1. Hindustani sounds may be classified in three different ways. Of these, one is *ghosh* and *aghosh*. These are Sanskrit words, used by native Sanskrit grammarians. *Ghosh* is the name of an indistinct rumbling sound which accompanies the enunciation of most of the letters of the alphabet, in fact all except p, f, s, sh, t, ṭ, k, kh, ḥ, and q. Hence the first seven of these (the three last do not occur in Sanskrit) are called by the grammarians *aghosh*, *i.e.* *non-ghosh*; and all the others *ghosh*.

2. Another mode of classification regards the particular organ of speech which is mostly employed in the utterance of the sound. (We say "mostly," because the throat must participate in all kinds of sounds; and the tongue in most, if not all, of them). These classes are (1) *labial* (2) *semilabial* (3) *dental* (4) *sibilant* (5) *lingual* (6) *palatal* (7) *guttural* (8) *superguttural* (9) *aspirate* (10) *nasal.* (1) The Labials are p, b, m, w, u, ū, and o. (2) Semilabials are f and v. (3) Dentals, t and d. (4) Sibilants, s, z, sh, zh and sh. (5) Linguals, n, l, r, y, i, ī, and e. (6) Palatals, ṭ, ḍ, ṇ, and ṛ. (7) Gutturals, k, g (hard), kh, gh, and ng. (8) Superguttурals, q ʿ* and ḥ. (9) Aspirates, h, a, and ā. (10) There is but one pure nasal, ñ. The others, *viz.*, m, n, ṇ and ng are nasal in *addition* to belonging to other classes; in which classes they are enumerated above.

Organs of Speech

3. We now explain how these ten kinds of sounds are formed. (1) Labials are produced by bringing the lips into either immediate, or very near, contact, and then emitting the breath. Thus, to produce p, b, and m the contact must be immediate between the front part of the lips; in w also the contact is immediate, but further back, and u, ū, and o are formed by keeping the lips farther apart. (2) Semilabials are produced by bringing the lower lip into close contact with the tips of the upper front teeth. (3) Dentals are formed by bringing the lip of the tongue into close contact with the lip of the upper front teeth. (4) Sibilants come by pressing the tongue against the back of the gums of the middle of the upper jaw. Of the three sibilants, s and z are formed by pressing the tongue low down, near (but not against)

Formation of Sounds

* By this sign we indicate the sound in the throat, which is called *ʿAin.*

the teeth; sh and zh by pressing it higher up; and sh by pressing it still higher up, very near the palate (thus involving a slight curling round of the tip of the tongue). Sh is the favourite sibilant in Bengali, and is very common in Sanskrit; but in Urdu it does not exist, and in Hindi no illiterate person can pronounce it, but says either "kh" or "chh" instead of it. Zh is the sound which the French give to the letter J, *e.gr.* "je" (I), "jamais" (never), "jardin" (garden). (5) What we call linguals, we call so for want of a more distinctive name; for, as aforesaid, the tongue is employed in most, if not to some extent in all, classes of sounds. Still, the sounds we call lingual *are* produced by bringing the tongue into contact with the back of the gums of the middle of the upper jaw, only in a different way from that which produces sibilants; and in each lingual, too, the mode of contact is different from that in the other linguals. Moreover, in n, l and r the contact is immediate; in y, i, ī, and e, it is not so. (6) Palatals are formed by curling the tongue back against the palate, or roof of the mouth. (7) Gutturals are wrongly so called, for they do not proceed from the throat, but from the back of the mouth above the throat; and are produced by contact of the back part of the tongue, near its root, with the parts of the mouth between the palate and the throat. (8) What we call supergutturals ought, from one point of view, to be called subgutturals; for they come from the throat itself, which is below, and not above, the part whence come the sounds commonly called gutturals. Yet this nomenclature would be confusing; for "sub" is generally understood to mean that the thing, to whose name it is attached, deserves that name in a *less* degree than it would if "sub" was not prefixed; whereas the sounds now in question are the only ones which really deserve the name "guttural." They are formed by partially contracting the throat in various ways. (9) Aspirates come only from the throat, with as little

intervention as possible from the other organs of speech. To form h, a slight effort is needed, besides the emission of air through the throat. To form a and ā, the throat shapes itself in different ways, but does not contract itself as in superguttturals. (10) Nasals are formed by passing the breath, more or less, through the nose. The pure nasal, ñ, is the same as occurs in so many French words (as "an," a year, "on," people in general, "un," one), and is quite as common in Hindustani as in French. The other nasals are formed by breathing through the nose *as well as* through the organ by which the particular sound is formed; thus, m is labial as well as nasal; n liquid, ṇ palatal, and ṅg guttural, besides being nasal.

4. There is yet a third way to divide Hindustani sounds, *viz.* according to the degree in which the air is passed between the two organs of speech employed in the production of any particular sound. From this point of view, the sounds consists of four classes, *viz. consonants, semi-consonants, semi-vowels* and *vowels.*

Transmission of Breath

(1) Consonants are the sounds which are produced by *complete* contact between two organs of speech. While complete contact is maintained, of course no sound is produced. But it is produced by snapping the two asunder. (Obviously, such sounds are *momentary;* they cannot be prolonged; if one wishes to reproduce them, one must bring the two organs again into contact, and thus form *two* sounds). Such are p, b, w, t, d, r, y, ṭ, ḍ, k, g (hard), q, ʿ, and ḥ. These are rightly called "*con*sonants," because they cannot be produced without being accompanied by vowels; for when the two organs of speech are snapped asunder, a vowel comes out with the other sound, whatever it may be.

Consonants

5. (2) Semiconsonants are those sounds that are formed by bringing the two organs of speech very near together, but leaving a space between them through which the breath can pass. The consequence of this is, that these sounds can be *prolonged*, as long as there is breath in the body to produce them. Such are f and v, m, the five sibilants, n and l, ṛ, kh and gh, and ng. Of these, as ṛ, kh, and gh seem to offer special difficulty to English people, it may be well to explain how to form them. Ṛ is the semiconsonantal form of ḍ. That is, any one who can form ḍ by curling his tongue back, putting it close against his palate, and then snapping it away from the palate, can equally well form ṛ by putting his tongue in exactly the same position, only not quite close against the palate, and then breathing between the tongue and the palate. Kh is not difficult to all English people, for many have already acquired it in speaking some other European languages. It is the semiconsonantal form of the consonant k, *i.e.* instead of bringing the root of the tongue into close contact with the back of the mouth, leave a little space for the air to pass between. But many, who can easily pronounce kh, find a great difficulty with gh; and yet it is pronounced by both Northumbrians and Prussians. It is the semiconsonantal form of g (hard), exactly as kh is of k; that is, whereas in g the two organs are in close contact, in gh there is left room between them for the breath to escape. And therefore these sounds can be *prolonged*. Lastly, besides all the above semiconsonantal sounds which occur in Hindustani, we should mention th (as in "thing") and th (as in "thou"), which are *Arabic* sounds, but are *not* used in Hindustani; the th (as in "thing") being pronounced like s, and the th (as in "thou") being sounded like z.

Semi-Consonants

6. (3) The *semi-vowels* are w and y. They may be called consonantal forms, respectively, of u and i. W is formed by putting the lips together in the same way as in forming u; only, whereas in forming the latter, the lips are kept wide apart, to form w they are made to touch one another completely for a moment, and then snapped asunder. Similarly, y comes by putting the tongue near the back of the gum of the front of the upper jaw, in the same way as in producing i; but bringing it into complete contact with that part, and then snapping it asunder. Hence, these two are really whole consonants, for they cannot be prolonged, because no air passes between the organs in forming them. But they are called semi-vowels, owing to their near affinity with the vowels u and i.

Semi-Vowels

7. (4) The *vowels* are formed by leaving a wide space between two organs of speech, and letting the breath pass freely between them. The labial vowels are u, ū, and o; the linguals, i, ī, and e; the gutturals, a and ā. On some of these, some remarks are necessary. (*a*) O is a modification of ū; *i.e.* the lips are put in a somewhat different way to form it, before the breath is emitted through them. But English people have to be very careful not to pronounce o in Hindustani as long o is pronounced in English. The English o is really a diphthong, *i.e.* is composed of the real o, and short u; but this diphthong is never used in Hindustani. The real o is pronounced in French and German; and *was* in English too, till somewhat more than a century ago. Another thing to notice is, that the sound of o in the English "hot" is alien to Hindustani. This is really the short form of the sound which we write au, aw (*e.gr.* "author," "fawn"); see below. The short form of o,

Vowels

The Vowel O

while common in French (*e.gr.* "botte"), and really pronounced in some unaccented syllables in Hindustani (*e.gr.* the second syllable of "logoñ," and the particle "to" when it has a concessive meaning; see Chapter 23) is *not recognized* in Hindustani. (*b*) Similarly, e is a modification of ī; and is *recognized* only as a long vowel, though in some unaccented syllables (*e.gr.* "meñ," "chaleñ") it is really pronounced short. Care must be taken by English people not to pronounce it like the English a (*e.gr.* "pane"), which is a diphthong composed of the real e (as in the French "et," "and") and short i. (*c*) As in English, so also in Hindustani, the short i is not really the short form of ī, but a different, though similar, sound. The really short form of i occurs in French and in Bengali; but not in English, Italian, or Hindustani. (*d*) Even more wide apart are the sounds which are written a and ā in Hindustani. The long form of "a" would be as in the English "slur," "burden"; which does not occur in Hindustani. And the short form of ā does not occur in English or in Hindustani; but is common in Continental languages. (*e*) A expresses perhaps the simplest of all sounds of which the human voice is capable; it is formed by simply emitting breath from the throat, without the effort needed for h. It is written "u" in English when followed by a consonant in the same syllable, *e.gr.* "bun," "pup"; but may be written by any vowel in an open syllable, as long as it is not accented. *E.gr.* the first and last letters of "America," as commonly pronounced, are instances of the sound here referred to. (*f*) $\overline{\text{A}}$ is perhaps the next simplest; it is formed by opening the throat wider than in a. But this is not a favourite sound with English people; they like to substitute for it the sound above mentioned, which we write au.

The Vowel E

Short I

A and $\overline{\text{A}}$

Hence they pronounce "Kānhpur" "Cawnpore;" "Nainī Tāl" "Naini Taul." And in some cases they go further, and turn the long ā into the short form of au, which we write o; *e.gr.* "doll" for "dāl," "molly" for "mālī." But both the long (as in "jaw"), and the short (as in "not") are foreign to Hindustani.

8. We have now mentioned all the simple sounds which occur in Hindustani. But besides these, there are many *compound* sounds, *i.e.* combinations of simple sounds. Among these, we do *not* reckon those combinations which in Nāgarī (the script in which Sanskrit and Hindi are commonly written) are *written* as two or more characters combined in one; for we are not now dealing with language as written, but *sounds*; and these combined characters do not express combined sounds, but only two consonants in close juxtaposition, without a vowel between them. The compound sounds we are treating of are of three kinds, *viz.* (1) aspirated consonants, (2) combinations of t with sh, and of d with zh, (3) combinations of vowels, commonly called diphthongs.

Compound Sounds

9. (1) The consonants which are aspirated are p, b, t, d, ṭ, ḍ, k, and g (hard); also ch and j (see below). These aspirated consonants are in the Persian and the Roman character written separately (*e.gr.* ph, bh, etc.); and from this one might suppose that aspirated consonants also should be excluded from our present consideration, as being only two consonants in close juxtaposition. Yet, as matter of fact, they do *not* consist of two sounds in simple juxtaposition; for the h enters much more closely into the enunciation of the other sound than (say) the second sound in nt, gn, etc., does with the first. This is the case with

Aspirate Consonants

Hindustani; and in Panjabi the blending of the two sounds is more intimate still, and therefore very difficult for foreigners to acquire. And the fact that, in the Sanskrit alphabet, these aspirated consonants are represented by characters all to themselves, *i.e.* which bear no resemblance to the unaspirated consonants to which they belong, seems to prove that in ancient times the blending was considered very intimate, perhaps quite as intimate as it is now in Panjabi.

10. (2) The combination of t with sh, and that of d with zh, produce the compound sounds which the English, alone of important European nations except the Russian, recognize; and the English write them as ch and j. While these sounds are as foreign to Western Asia as they are to the continent of Europe outside Russia, it is remarkable that from Persia eastwards they are common in all important languages. But a still more remarkable thing is, that in these languages they are not reckoned as compound sounds, but have characters all to themselves. Yet a moment's thought suffices to show that they *are* compounds. Let any one, for instance, try to pronounce the reduplicated ch in "sachchā" (true), or the reduplicated j in "lajjā" (shame), and he will find that the ch and the j are *not* reduplicated in utterance, but in "sachchā" t is doubled, and sh is pronounced single, and in "lajjā" d is doubled, and zh is pronounced single. But now it must be observed, and stress laid on the fact, that the t and d, which enter into the composition respectively of ch and j, are neither the dentals nor the palatals of Hindustani, but the *English* t and d, which are formed by putting the tongue neither against the teeth nor against the palate, but between the two, *i.e.* against the back of the upper gum. Hence they are really *linguals;* though when Hindustanis have to write English words which contain them in.

CH and J

their own characters, they write the palatals, *viz.* ṭ and ḍ, because to their ear they sound nearer to these than to the dentals.

(*N.B.*—In most grammars, ch and j are called palatals, and what we have called palatals are called cerebrals; but as the latter have nothing to do with the brain, but are pronounced with the palate, it seems only right to call *them* palatals, and to reckon ch and j as *compound linguals*).

11. (3) Diphthongs are combinations of vowels. They are in Hindustani only two, *viz.* ai and au. The former is a combination of short a and short i; the latter is formed by combining short a and short u. Care must be taken by those familiar with Continental languages to avoid thinking that ai is composed with the short form of ā, which, as we have seen, is as foreign to Hindustani as it is to English; or that the first member of the compound sound au is the same. The sound of ai is exactly the same as is written in English i (*e.gr.* "twice"); and that of au is precisely the same as is in English written ou or ow (*e.gr.* "cloud," "now"). It must also be observed that in a considerable part of Hindustan, of which perhaps Agra is the centre, uneducated people do not pronounce diphthongs at all, but say e instead of ai, and o in place of au.

Diphthongs

12. Of all the Hindustani sounds now enumerated, some have come into it from one source, and some from another; and consequently, to a great extent, the presence of a particular sound in a word indicates the origin of that word. (1) The superguttural are all Arabic; any Hindustani word which contains any of them must have come from Arabic. (2) Zh is a Persian sound; any Hindustani

Origins of Sounds

word (like "muẓhda," good news), which contains it must have come from Persian. (3) All aspirated consonants and all palatals are of Indian origin; all Hindustani words which contain any of them must be derived from Sanskrit. (4) Kh, z, f and gh are found both in Arabic and in Persian; therefore their presence in Hindustani words, while it stamps those words as of foreign origin, does not decide whether they come from Arabic or Persian. (5) P and ch are common to Persian and Sanskrit; therefore their presence in Hindustani words, while it shows those words to be of Aryan, and not Shemitic, origin, leaves it an open question whether they come from Sanskrit or from Persian.

13. Besides all these Hindustani sounds there are others, of which some belong to Arabic and others to Sanskrit, which are *written but not pronounced* in Hindustani, and therefore do not, properly speaking, belong to Hindustani at all. However, it will be well just to mention them here, and then they need not be referred to again.

Sounds Rejected in Hindustani

(1) Of those which belong to Arabic, we have already mentioned th as in "thing," which is in Hindustani pronounced s, and th as in "thou," which is in this language pronounced z. Others are those called zāl and zoe, both of which are likewise pronounced z in Hindustani; and the sound called toe, which is pronounced t (dental).

(2) Of those which belong to Sanskrit, (*a*) ri is written with a special character in Nāgarī, but is pronounced in Hindustani like a syllable composed of r and i. In Sanskrit, however, it is a vowel; but how that vowel was pronounced in ancient times, no one knows. In Mahrāṭhī it is pronounced more like ru than ri; but that is no more a vowel than ri is.

(*b*) The character called Visarga is pronounced in Hindustani as a slight h. (*c*) In Sanskrit there is a nasal which seems to have been pronounced much like gn in Italian (*e.gr.* "Signor"). It often occurs in juxtaposition with, and after, j; and this combination is represented in Nāgarī by a special character. In Mahrāṭhī it is pronounced "dn"; but in Hindustani no attempt seems to be made to express either the j or the peculiar nasal; it is pronounced simply like gy; *e.gr.* "gyān" (wisdom).

14. Apart from the above sounds, which do not really occur in Hindustani at all, there are others which *do* belong to this language, and yet are rejected (1) by all but pedants, (2) by the illiterate. (1) All but pedants, in speaking *Hindustani*, say n for ṇ, kh or chh (according to the part of the country) for sh, z for zh. The three superguttturals occupy three degrees in this matter. The pronunciation of none of them can be called actually pedantic; yet ḥ most nearly approaches pedantry, ʿ is further from it, and q is so far from it that all educated persons aim at pronouncing it. (2) When we come to the real vernacular Hindustani, *i.e.* the language as pronounced by illiterates, we find many more sounds rejected; though even here, as is natural, there are differences between East and West, and also between citizens and rustics. But, allowing for these differences, we may say in general that popular Hindustani says s for sh ("Sibboleth" for "Sibboleth"), kh for kh, j for z, k for q, g (hard) for gh; ph for f, kh or chh for the compound ksh (*e.gr.* the Sanskrit "Kshatriya," the name of the warrior caste, becomes in some part of the country "Khatrī," in another "Chhatrī"); drops ʿ altogether; and generally turns w, when immediately followed by a vowel, into b. (To this

Sounds Commonly Rejected

last, however, there are some notable exceptions, *e.gr.* "wah" or "wuh," "wahāñ," etc.).

15. In pronouncing Hindustani there are *three* things which foreign learners should be specially careful about. (1) *Distinguishing between dental and palatals.* The fact that of the English, French and German languages none uses either dentals or palatals, but something between, offers a strong temptation to natives of those three countries to be content with their own t's and d's, giving these sounds to both the Hindustani dentals and the palatals, and thus pronouncing these alike. But this is never done by Indians. (2) *Pronouncing the aspirate in aspirated consonants.* The neglect of this also is a fault into which a foreigner easily slips, because we have no aspirated consonants in our own languages; at least, we have none *recognized;* for we, specially the Irish, often *do* aspirate the initial consonant of a word, specially when we wish to be very emphatic. But the neglect of the aspirate in Hindustani is a fault into which Hindustanis themselves never fall. (3) *Pronouncing reduplicated consonants double, i.e.* dwelling on such consonants for twice the time that it takes to utter a single consonant. This, too, is absent from English, French and German; but it is present in Italian, as also is the pronunciation of dentals. And no Hindustani, uncorrupted by Europeans, neglects the doubling of such consonants. There are many words which involve both the second and the third rule, and which being therefore specially difficult, should be specially an object of the learner's effort and care, *e.gr.* "makkhan," "butter:" "achchhā," "good:" "chiṭṭhī," "a letter:" "Buddha," "awakened." The observance of these three rules is of far more importance for a foreign learner than the correct pronunciation of Arabic and Persian sounds. These, for the most part

Three Essential matters

at least, do not affect the meaning of words, whereas the confusion of dentals and palatals, the pronunciation of aspirated consonants without the aspirate, and of doubled consonants as if they were single, cause great confusion as to the meaning of what is said.

16. We will conclude this chapter with some remarks about certain of the Hindustani sounds. (1) Popular Hindustani tends to avoid juxtaposition of consonants. This is curious, seeing that probably there is no language which delights in juxtaposition of two, three, or even four consonants as Sanskrit does. But the illiterate insert vowels, or prefix them, to avoid this juxtaposition, or to ease it, *e.gr.* "strī," a woman, becomes "istarī" in the speech of the simple.

Consonants not juxtaposed

(2) S is in Hindustani *never* pronounced as z, as it is in Western European languages. *E.gr.* most foreign missionaries pronounce "baptisma," "baptizma," because in English the s in "baptism" is pronounced like z. But Hindustanis are quite free from this weakness; and foreigners should imitate *them*.

S never as z

(3) In the derivation of Hindustani from Sanskrit, and also in the popular speech of to-day, there is a strong tendency to turn s and sh into h. *E.gr.* "nahān" comes from "snān;" "chaudah" from "chaturdash;" and while 70 is "sattar," 71 is "ekhattar." These are regular, literary Hindustani words; but villagers turn, *e.gr.* "nishchay" into "nihachay;" "pushpa" into "puhap," a flower; and so on.

Sibilants become h

(4) The linguals r, l, and n are often interchanged in popular speech; but also in the derivation of literary

R, L, N Interchanged

Hindustani from Sanskrit; *e.gr.* "nikalnā" (to go out) is from "nishkraman," and "nūn" or "non" (salt) from "lawan."

Omission of h

(5) The fault of the English Midlands, to drop h where it should be pronounced, and to pronounce it where it has no right to be, is found in Hindustani in only a few words. "Isī" for "is-hī," is one of them. And in the Panjābī "hor," for "aur," the h is incorrect. Another instance is "hoñṭh" (a lip), which comes from the Sanskrit "oshtha." But such instances are very rare.

Ghosh becomes aghosh

(6) In the derivation of Hindustani from Sanskrit, as in that of the Romance languages from Latin, there is a strong tendency to substitute the *ghosh* for the *aghosh*. *E.gr.* "log" is from the Sanskrit "loka:" "magar" (an alligator) from "makara;" "ghoṛā" (a horse) from "ghoṭaka."

The pure Nasal

(7) The pure nasal—called in Sanskrit and Hindi "anuswār"—is much more frequent in Hindustani than in Sanskrit. Not only do other nasals become the pure nasal, *e.gr.* "nām" becomes "nāñw," and "grām" (village), "gāñw" (in these two cases the m does not altogether become the pure nasal, but is resolved into it *and* the w); but other letters also, *viz.* "kūpā" (a well) becomes "kūāñ," and "madhya" (middle) becomes "meñ." And the pure nasal is often inserted between a vowel and a following consonant, without any apparent reason except the fondness of Hindustani for it. *E.gr.* "puchchha" (tail) becomes "pūñchh."

Ng rare

(8) Ng occurs in Hindustani only immediately before k, kh, g (hard), and gh. It never occurs at the end of a word, as in the English "bring," "strong," "lung."

F for ph

(9) We have said that the illiterate turn f into ph in pronouncing Arabic and Persian words which contain f. But it is also true that, by a curious perversity of human nature, they often pronounce ph as f, in Hindi words (Sanskrit has no f); such as "fal" for "phal" (fruit), "fir" for "phir" (again).

Y becomes J

(10) The Sanskrit y, at the beginning of a word, is invariably turned into j in Hindustani. *E.gr.* all the relatives, which in Hindustani begin with j, are derived from Sanskrit relatives beginning with y. Also "Yavana," "a Greek," becomes "Jawan" or "Jaun" (hence "Jaunpur," "Greek-town," because the Muhammadan invaders were supposed to be Greeks returned); "yashas," "fame," becomes "jas;" "yantra" becomes "jantar," etc.

K and ch

(11) There is a curious connexion, the cause of which is not obvious to our ears, between k and ch. There are very many instances of it in English, *e.gr.* that "kirk" and "church," "Michael" and "Mitchell" are only different forms of the same word. In Sanskrit Grammar the two are constantly interchanged; much less often in Hindustani. A good instance of it, however, is the connection between "paknā," "to be cooked" or "ripened," and "pachnā," "to be digested," *i.e.* cooked by animal heat.

CHAPTER III.

Genders of Nouns.

Neglect of Gender

1. There is nothing in Hindustani which more distinguishes a person who speaks it correctly from one who speaks it incorrectly, than the observance or neglect of gender. Nearly all Europeans, and that numerous class of Indians (such as domestic servants) who live in constant association with Europeans, also Indians whose vernacular is another (such as hill-men), but whom their employments compel to use Hindustani,—all these neglect gender; *i.e.* they treat all nouns as masculine. This is partly due to the indolence and indifference of most Europeans with regard to native languages, a feeling which is strengthened by the contempt which is (however reprehensible) natural to rulers towards their inferiors; they do not think it worth their while to trouble themselves with the niceties of the subjects' language; and all that they think they need acquire of it is what is just sufficient for the supply of their own wants. But a concurrent cause is the fact, that the real vernacular, *i.e.* the village speech, of the Eastern part of Hindustan, *has no gender;* in this it resembles Bengali, in which both the literary and the common speech are genderless. And Europeans first settled, in North India, in Bengal, and from there gradually spread into Hindustan, bringing with them, more or less unconsciously, a tradition opposed to distinction of genders. On the other hand, the *vernacular* of the Western part of Hindustan, and

not only its literary language, observes these distinctions; and more and more carefully, the nearer it approaches Panjabi, a language which does observe them.

Another general fact which has to be remembered with regard to gender is that in many cases the same word bears a different gender in different parts of the country; *e.gr.* "gīt" (a song) is in one part masculine, and in another feminine. Also there are words, about the gender of which even the best native authorities are undetermined; *e.gr.* "ghaur" (consideration). And "charchā" is feminine in Hindi, because it is a Tatsama word, and in Sanskrit it is feminine; but in Urdu it is masculine, because it ends in "ā."

Local Difference

2. On the whole, the gender of Hindustani nouns derived from Sanskrit follows that of the nouns from which they are derived; words neuter in Sanskrit becoming, for the most part, masculine in Hindustani. Hence a knowledge of Sanskrit is of as great help to remembering the gender of Hindustani nouns as a knowledge of Latin is to remembering the gender of French nouns. Yet there are several exceptions, due to various causes, which must be learnt by sheer memory. The gender of Hindustani nouns derived from Arabic, similarly, follows generally the gender of the Arabic originals; but this rule is not nearly as reliable as the corresponding rule for the gender of *Tadbhava* words derived from Sanskrit. *E.gr.* "rūh" ("spirit") is masculine in Arabic, but feminine in Hindustani. Yet nouns of Arabic origin, which begin or end with t, are in nearly every case feminine. The Persian language has no gender; hence Hindustani nouns derived therefrom acquire their gender from some cause indigenous to India.

Causes of Hindustani Gender

3. One of the most potent of these causes is the fact that the ending ī, which in Sanskrit indicates the feminine only in some few classes of nouns (the usual feminine ending in Sanskrit being ā), has in Hindustani become the regular ending indicative of the feminine, in all those nouns and adjectives in which the masculine ends in ā. Hence the Persian abstract nouns which end in ī are in Hindustani feminine (*e.gr.* "mihrbānī ("kindness"), "badī" ("badness"). (Those Persian adjectives which end in h when written in the Persian characters even though the h is not pronounced, and therefore not written in the Roman character, form their abstract nouns by turning this h into g; *e.gr.* from "āsūda," "satisfied," comes "āsūdagī," satisfaction;" from "pukẖta," "ripe" or "perfect," comes "pukẖtagī," "ripeness" or "perfection;" from "banda," "a slave," comes "bandagī," "servitude"). And not only are abstract nouns formed in Hindustani, by the addition of ī, from Hindi as well as Persian adjectives (*e.gr.* "baṛāī," greatness, "lambāī," length), but this ending is also appended, in the vernacular, to the Sanskrit abstract feminine affix tā, which therefore really needs no addition. *E.gr.* "pawitra" means "holy"; "pawitratā" is sufficient to express "holiness;" but the ordinary Hindustani feels that "tā" does not sufficiently express either the abstract or the feminine gender, and therefore says "pawitratāī." In some other cases also the vernacular adds an ī to a word already feminine, *e.gr.* "der" ("lateness") and "dawā" (medicine) are both feminine; yet because they do not end in ī the illiterate do not feel that they are so, and therefore say "derī" and "dawāī."

The Feminine ending Ī

4. The masculine termination ā in Hindustani is formed by the coalescing of two a's. The great majority of masculine and neuter nouns and adjectives in

Sanskrit end in a (to which are appended various terminations, according to case and number). But later Sanskrit developed a tendency to add the syllable ka to this a. Then, in Prākrit, the k was elided, leaving the two a's side by side; which in time coalesced into one long ā. Hence (*e.gr.*) the late Sanskrit "ghoṭaka" has become "ghoṛā," a horse.

The Masculine ending A

5. In some cases the gender of nouns of Indian origin has been determined by that of words, of the same meaning, of foreign origin. Thus though "pustak" (a book) is neuter in Sanskrit, it is feminine in Hindi, because "kitāb," an Arabic word with the same meaning, is so; and many treat even "ātmā" (soul) as feminine, though masculine in Sanskrit, because "rūḥ" is feminine. On the other hand, by what looks like sheer perversity, "mahimā" (greatness) is feminine in Hindustani, though masculine in Sanskrit, and though the great majority of Hindustani words in ā are masculine.

Effect of false Analogy

6. Masculine nouns ending in ī, besides such isolated instances as "pānī" (water), "ghī" (clarified butter) and "motī" (a pearl), are either nouns denoting possession or action (*e.gr.* "mālī," one who makes mālās, *i.e.* garlands, hence "gardener"; "hāthī," an animal with a hand ("hāth"), *i.e.* an elephant), or else properly adjectives derived from Sanskrit adjectives in *īya*, *e.gr.* "deshī," belonging to a country ("desh"), hence "native," both as adjective and as noun.

Masculines in Ī

CHAPTER IV.

Cases and Postpositions.

1. Most Hindustani grammarians confuse these; saying, *e.gr.* that "ādmī kā" is the genitive of "ādmī," "Banāras ko" the accusative or dative of "Banāras," "rājā ne" the agentive case of "rājā," "ghar se" the ablative of "ghar," and "shahr meñ," or "par," or "tak" the locative case of "shahr." But "ko" and "ne" and "se" and "meñ" and "par" and "tak" (we reserve the consideration of "kā" till later) are separate words, called "postpositions" because they always *follow* the noun to which they are attached, but otherwise exactly like prepositions. One might as well call "with a sword" the ablative case of "sword," or "in the city" the locative of "city," as call the corresponding phrases above mentioned the "cases" of their several nouns.

Commonly Confused

2. Yet there *are* cases to Hindustani nouns, *i.e.* modifications of the noun, whether by addition of a syllable, or by change of a vowel in the noun. Some of these "cases" apply to *all* nouns, *viz.* (1) the *vocative plural* which is formed by the addition of "o"; *e.gr.* "he ādmīo," "O men!" "ai jānwaro," "O animals!" (2) *all plurals when followed by a postposition*, and then add the syllable "oñ" as "ādmīoñ ko," "for men." "jānwaroñ meñ," "among animals." In forming these cases of nouns ending in ī, care should be taken to ascertain whether the noun is originally Indian, or borrowed

The Cases

from Persian or Arabic. In the latter case, the ī undergoes no change before the addition of *o* or *oñ*; hence "he ādmīo" as above, "garmīoñ meñ," "in the hot season" (lit. "in heats"). But nouns originally Indian turn the final ī into iy before o or oñ; *e.gr.* "he striyo!" "O women!" "ghoṛiyoñ par," "on mares."

N.B.—Masculines ending in ā lose it before *o* and oñ; *e.gr.* "he andho," "O blind men!" "langṛoñ ko," "for lame people."

Besides these, there are two other cases, which apply only to certain nouns. (1) Masculines ending in ā change this into e (*a*) in the vocative singular, (*b*) when followed by postpositions;* *e.gr.* "he andhe!" "O blind man!" "ghoṛe par," "on a horse." (*c*) in the plural *not* followed by a postposition, *e.gr.* "ghoṛe," horses. (2) Feminine nouns, when *not* followed by a postposition, add, to form the plural number, (*a*) "eñ" when they (in the singular) end in a consonant or ā, but (*b*) "āñ" when they end in i, ī, u, or ū. And before "āñ" i and ī become iy in words originally Indian. *E.gr.* "bāteñ," "words;" "āwashyakatāeñ," "necessities;" "striyāñ," "women;" "bahuāñ," "daughters-in-law."

3. Postpositions are of two kinds, *viz.* those which are attached to the noun immediately, and those which have ke or kī between themselves and the noun; or, what comes to the same thing in the case of personal pronouns, the use of the possessive pronoun instead of the personal, in this case

Kinds of Postpositions

* Also before the adjectival affixes "kā" and "wālā," and the affix "pan" denoting an abstract noun when followed by a postposition; *e.gr.* ghoṛe kā," "ghoṛewālā" (a groom); "andhepan kā ilāj," "a remedy for blindness."

ending in e or ī. Instances of the former kind have been given above; instances of the latter kind are "rājā ke sāth," "with the king," "āsmān kī taraf," "towards the sky," "mere pās," "near me," "tumhārī bābat," "concerning you." This "ke" and "kī" are themselves cases, *i.e.* modifications, of the adjectival affix *kā;* which will not be treated in this chapter, but in a subsequent one, for a reason which will then be apparent. Now, most postpositions, and perhaps all of them, are either still used also as nouns, or else are derived from ancient nouns; and therefore we infer that, in most instances at least, the ke or kī was originally used with all postpositions; in other words, all postpositions were once of the *second* kind above mentioned. Accordingly, there are some postpositions in which the usage is doubtful, *i.e.* whether to attach them directly to the noun, or not. *E.gr.* in what is considered good Hindustani "pās" takes a "ke" between the noun or pronoun and itself, as "us ke pās," "near him," "Sāhib ke pās," "near the gentleman." But in the south-east the ke is omitted by those who do not aspire to quite correct Hindustani; they say "us pās," "Sāhib pās."

Origin of Postpositions

4. But in process of time those postpositions which are in most constant use seem to have dropped the intermediate "ke" or "kī," to save time. *E.gr.* "meñ" originally meant "middle," being derived from the Sanskrit "madhya." Hence the former use must have been "ke meñ," "in the middle of." But this suggests another thought. "Ke meñ" contains no word for "in;" it only means "middle of." The fact is, that there must have been originally another "meñ" (or some other word, or perhaps case-ending, of the same meaning) after the "meñ" which has survived. Take two other instances. "Pās" originally meant the "side" of a

person, or animal; hence "near him" was probably first expressed by "us ke pās par," "at his side;" but gradually the "par," or whatever the word was, was dropped. Again, "taraf" means "direction;" so that "towards him" was first expressed by "us kī taraf ko," "to his direction;" but in time the "ko" was dropped. This is the only way of accounting for the fact, that when the postposition is masculine, the word inserted between it and the noun is not "kā," but "ke," the modification which "kā" *always assumes before a postposition;* so that, *e.gr.* "near him" is not "us kā pās," because "pās" was first followed by another postposition. It also accounts for the fact, that when the postposition, which is joined to the noun by "ke," was originally a noun ending in ā, it invariably assumes the modified form which a following postposition requires; *e.gr.* "sāmhnā," the front, "ke sāmhne," "in front of;" "pīchhā," "the hinderpart," "ke pīchhe," "behind" or "after."

Omission of Postpositions

5. Another confirmation of this theory is, that many nouns, which are not *reckoned* as postpositions at all, may be used, and indeed are *preferably* used, with the following postpositions understood, not expressed. *E.gr.* "rāt ke waqt," "at night time," is better than "rāt ke waqt meñ;" "talwār kī jagah," in the sense of "*instead* of a sword," is preferable to "talwār kī jagah meñ;" "naukar ke hāth bhejnā," "to send by the hand of a servant," is better than "naukar ke hāth se bhejnā;" "sir ke bal girnā," "to fall head-long," is obligatory instead of "sir ke bal se girnā"; "salāmat chale jāo" is used rather than "salāmat se chale jāo," "go in peace," and "to send a letter to so-and-so's address" is "fulāñ ke nām khatt bhejnā," without a postposition after "nām." And "kām ānā" is quite as good as "kām meñ ānā," in the sense of "to be used" (lit. "to come

into work"). Similarly the postposition "ko" is omitted after names of places, when they occur in a subordinate part of the sentence. *E.gr.* "Maiñ Banāras ko jāuñgā" is better than "Maiñ Banāras jāungā"; but "maiñ ne Banāras jāne kā bandobast kiyā hai" is better than the same with "ko" inserted. "Ko" may also be omitted, and *should* be when the sentence needs to be lightened, after the infinitive of purpose. *E.gr.* "Maiñ chakkū lene gayā thā," "I went to fetch a pen-knife," is better than with "ko" after "lene."

Same Postposition not repeated

6. There is no need to repeat the same postposition after every one of a string of nouns, when the postpositions would be used in the same sense. Indeed, it is not idiomatic to use it more than once, *viz.* after the last noun in the series. In English, also, it is not idiomatic to repeat the preposition after the *first* noun; yet our English Bible has followed a Hebrew idiom, and has everywhere repeated the preposition (*e.gr.* Is. 29: 13, "with their mouth and *with* their lips do honour me;" Deut. 29: 28, "rooted them out of their land in anger, and *in* wrath, and *in* great indignation"); but this practice should not be followed in Hindustani, even in translation.

Postpositions Combined

Postpositions are combined in Hindustani much more than in English. *E.gr.* in "some of them" we employ only one preposition; but the Hindustani says "un *meñ se* kitne," lit. "some from among them;" "Yahowā mere sahāyakoñ *meñ kā* hai," "Jehovah is among my helpers," *i.e.* "one of them;" "Get out of the boat" is "nāw *par se* utaro (lit. "from on the boat"), not simply "se utaro."

Apposition

7. There is a peculiar idiom in Hindustani, by which the amount of a thing is put in apposition with the thing itself, instead of being combined with it by "kā," * as it is combined by "of" in English. *E.gr.* we say "two pair *of* horses," "ten yards *of* cloth," "a whole seer *of* milk;" but Hindustanis say "do joṛī ghoṛe," "das gaz kapṛā," "ser bhar dūdh."

Peculiar use of "ke"

8. "Ke" (or the modified masculine form of possessive pronouns) is often used with nothing apparently following it, but really "pās," "badan meñ," or some similar word or phrase is understood; *e.gr.* "Mere pāñch beṭiyāñ haiñ," "I have five daughters," lit. "five daughters are [near] me;" us ke bahut koṛe lagāye gaye," "he was scourged much," lit. many scourges were applied in his [body]."

Different uses of Postpositions

9. One of the greatest difficulties which a foreigner finds in learning *any* new language is in the use of prepositions or postpositions; for different peoples, to express the same thing, in very many cases do *not* use the corresponding one in each other's languages. And this applies fully in the case of English and Hindustani. *E.gr.* we ask "what time is it *by* your watch?" but Hindustanis ask, "Ap kī gharī *meñ* kai baje haiñ?;" we speak of buying or selling a thing *for* so much, but they say "itne *meñ* mol liyā," or "bech diyā;"

---

*We have said that "kā," being not really a postposition but an adjectival affix, will be treated in a following chapter (chap. VII). Yet in many ways it does the same work as postpositions; and therefore it is convenient to treat it, in some connexions, in this and the following two sections of this chapter.

we ask "Which is the road *to* the city," but they, "shahar *kā* rastā kaun hai?;" we speak of swearing *by* God, whereas Hindustanis say "Khudā *kī* qasam khānā;" we say or speak *to* a person, but they "us *se*" (*i.e.* "with") "kahte" or "bolte haiñ;" we say "Solomon built a house *for* the name of Jehovah," but they say he built it "Yahowā ke nām *kā*;" we say "he formed his servants *in* different companies," but the Hindi is "us ne apne dāsoñ *ke* alag alag dal bāndhe." But though the material, of which a thing is made, has "kā" added to its name if that material is mentioned simply—*e.gr.* "us ne apnā ghar patthar *kā* banwāyā," "he had his house built of stone,"—yet, if the material be particularized, *i.e.* treated as individual, not as a class, the postposition used is *se*. *E.gr.* "us ne apnā ghar un pattharoñ *se* banwāyā, jo Labānon meñ khode gaye the," "he had his house made of those stones, which had been dug out in Lebanon." Again, we say "*on* Sunday" and "*by* day;" but Hindustanis say "Itwār *ko*" and "din *ko*;" though "din meñ" is also used. "Ko" is also used with the days of the month, as well as those of the week; but *not* of months or years, which take "meñ."

Ko

10. We will now make some observations on each of those postpositions (except "meñ," and also "kā" which will be treated later), which are immediately attached to their nouns. And first, the postposition "ko." As is well known, this (*a*) corresponds to what we call both the dative and the accusative cases, in other words is used both with the direct and the indirect object; and (*b*) is sometimes used, and sometimes not used, with the direct object. Both these facts make the use of "ko" very perplexing to a foreigner: for it seems strange that the dative and the accusative should be expressed by the same word; and also, in the case of the latter, the foreigner is

puzzled to know when to use it, and when to omit it. To some extent, this surprise and perplexity may be lessened by considering that the original meaning of "ko" is "to" or "for," *i.e.* to express the *indirect* object of an action. When a Hindustani uses "ko" where we should say it was the direct object, it is *not to him* the direct object, but the indirect. *E.gr.* in "us ne mujh ko mārā," "he struck me," we think of "me" as the direct object of the striking; but the Hindustani thinks of the blow as delivered *to* me. We do not mean that he consciously goes through this process of thought; but something like this must have been in the minds of the people when the idiom was first formed. But this does not go far in guiding the foreigner to decide when to use "ko," and when not; for he cannot know, by himself, *where* the Hindustani thinks of what he (the foreigner) regards as the direct object, as an indirect one; and therefore this question as to the use or disuse of "ko" is pre-eminently one in which the foreigner must be ever learning the native idiom by contact with Hindustanis, both in speaking and in reading. Only, it is safe to say that foreigners are in the habit of using "ko" for the direct object *much more* than natives do. Still, there are certain cases in which the above consideration is a real help, when it is applied to them.

With Name of Person

(1) "Ko" is always used with the proper name of a person. So much is this the case, that this rule overrides the cacophony of two "ko's" coming near together, *e.gr.* "Lābān ne apnī beṭī Leā ko apnī laundī Jilpā ko diyā," Laban gave his maid Zilpah to his daughter Leah." But where a person is spoken of without his name being given, "ko" need not be used; *e.gr.* "he took a wife" is not "us ne strī ko kiyā," but "us ne strī kii."

(2) Generally, in sentences where the same verb has both a direct and an indirect object, "ko" is used with

the former, and not with the latter. *E.gr.* "us ne apne ghoṛe ko Rājā kahā," "he called his horse Rājā;" "Parameshwar ne ujiyāle ko din kahā," "God called the light day." If we turn these sentences thus, "he gave the name Rājā to his horse," and "God gave the name Day to the light," we can see at once why "ko" is used with "apne ghoṛe" and "ujiyāle." Yet this rule is far from absolute; *e.gr.* "maiñ terā nām baṛā karūngā" is better than "maiñ tere nām ko baṛā karūngā" for "I will make thy name great," though the latter is not wrong.

With Direct Object

(3) The fact, that the use of "ko" does not give to a Hindustani, as it does to us, the feeling of a direct object, accounts for this also, that whereas we have to use a pronoun as well as a noun when two verbs have the same object, the Hindustani feels no need for this, and does not do it. *E.gr.* in "having gathered the assembly together, they gave *them* the letter," we insert "them" because we feel that whereas "the assembly" is the direct object of "having gathered together," it is only the indirect object of "they gave;" but to a Hindustani's mind "the assembly" is the indirect object of both verbs equally; and therefore they would say "unhoñ ne jamāʿat ko jamaʿ karke khatt de diyā." So, in the prayer "mujhe barakat de aur mahfūz rakh," "give me a blessing and keep me safe," *we* feel that the first "me" is dative and the second accusative; but to a Hindustani they are so entirely alike that one "mujhe" suffices for both.

Two uses combined

11. There is a difference of usage between the east and west of Hindustan as to the gender and number of an *adjective* which expresses the remote object, when the immediate object has a "ko" attached; *viz.* in the west this adjective is always masculine

singular, whereas in the East its number and gender vary with that of the immediate object. *E.gr.* "he gathered together the women" would be, in the east, "us ne ʿauratoñ ko ekaṭṭhī kiyā," but in the west "us ne ʿauratoñ ko ekaṭṭhā kiyā;" and "he gathered the men" would be in the east "us ne mardoñ ko ekaṭṭhe kiyā," but in the west "us ne mardoñ ko ekaṭṭhā kiyā."

Gender of Adjective

12. Lastly, if the remote object be a *participle* usage varies as to whether, in the *masculine* gender, the participle be put in the modified or the unmodified form; but the modified form is generally preferred. *E.gr.* "Yeshūʿ ne Matī nām ek shakhs ko mahsūl ki chaukī par *baiṭhe* dekhā," "Jesus saw a man named Matthew *seated* at the customs-office;" "Yeshūʿ ne Natan'el ko apnī taraf *āte* dekhā," "Jesus saw Nathanael *coming* to him."

Form of Participle

13. Care should be taken by learners not to suppose that "to" may always be rendered by "ko." *E.gr.* one such has been heard to say "Sāhib ko lejāo," in the sense of "Take it to the gentleman;" whereas this can mean only "Take away the gentleman." In the sense intended, the Hindustani is "Sāhib *ke pās* le jāo," lit. "Take (it) *to the side* of the gentleman."

"To" not always "ko"

14. "Se" has two distinct meanings; probably it is derived from two distinct Sanskrit words. The derivation of "se," meaning "from," is uncertain; the other "se," meaning "with," is certainly connected with "sāth," "sang," and many other words which eventually spring from the

Se

Sanskrit "sa" (*e.gr.* "saputra," "with his son," "his son included"); for as "with" first denoted accompaniment, and afterwards was used also for the instrument, and even for the manner, of an action, so "se" is derived from words denoting accompaniment, though itself is generally used only for the instrument and the manner of an action. An exception to this last statement, however, is its use with "kahnā" and "bolnā" and "bāteñ karnā." "To say, or speak, *to*" a person must never be rendered in Hindustani "us ko kahnā," etc., which has quite a different meaning (see Chap. XVI., § 8), but "us *se* kahnā," etc.; the only possible explanation of which is that Hindustanis regard speech as something done *with* a person, rather than as directed *to* him.

The "with" meaning of "se" is also the cause of its use with causal verbs (see Chap. XIV), with passives (see Chap. XIII), and neuter verbs (see Chap. XIII).

But the "from" meaning is the origin of its use with comparatives, in the sense of "than" (see Chap. VI); for the more is regarded as at a distance *from* the less.

15. The result of "se" being used in such a variety of meanings is, that it is often ambiguous, and this ambiguity has to be guarded against by various devices. *E.gr.* one would naturally translate "become not unclean thereby" by "us se ashuddh na honā"; but this would, to an Indian, more naturally mean "become not *more* unclean than he, or she, is."

Ambiguous

16. The following are some of the devices alluded to; not only to avoid ambiguity, but also to prevent two "se's" coming too close together, which is cacophonous to a Hindustani. (1) "*ke wasīle*" (Urdu) or "*ke dwārā*" (Hindi); *e.gr.* the above sentence should be rendered "us ke dwārā ashuddh na

Remedies therefor

honā." (2) "*ke bal*," lit. "by force of;" *e.gr.* "jis ko maiñ ne Emoriyoñ ke hāth se apnī talwār aur dhanush ke bal le liyā hai," "which I have taken out of the hand of the Amorites *by* my sword and bow." (3) "*kī qudrat se*" (Urdu) or "*kī shakti se*" (Hindi), lit. "by the power of;" *e.gr.* "wuh Rūhu'lquds kī qudrat se peṭ meñ paṛā," "He was conceived by the Holy Ghost." (4) "*kī taraf se*" (Urdu) or "*kī or se*" (Hindi), lit. "from the direction of" (compare the French "de la part de"); *e.gr.* "Parameshwar kī or se bhalāī hī bhalāī hotī hai," "nothing but good comes from God." (5) "*kī hidāyat se*" or "*ke sikhāne se*," lit. "by the teaching of." *E.gr.* "un meñ se ek ne Rūh kī hidāyat se zāhir kiyā," "one of them declared *by* the Spirit;" "jo maiñ kah rahā hūñ, so usī ke sikhāne se kahtā hūñ," "what I am saying, I am saying *from Him*."

With "jab"

17. "Se" is used redundantly in speaking of the beginning of a definite portion of time; *e.gr.* "jab se maiñ yahāñ āyā, tab se mujhe dukh hī dukh bhognā paṛā," "ever since I came here, I have had to experience nothing but trouble." Here, logically speaking, the "se" is useless, because my coming is considered as at a point of time, not as the commencement of a state. Yet idiom requires "jab se" in a case like this; possibly because it seems to balance "tab se."

Par

18. "Par," besides its radical meaning of "on" (it is an abbreviation of "ūpar") in a local sense, is often translateable rather by "at," *e.gr.* "darwāze par," "at the door." Also, like "on," it often has a temporal meaning, *e.gr.* "is par," "hereupon," *i.e.* "after this." Also it often has a *cumulative* force (as if heaping one thing *on* another) *e.gr.* "Yākūb ke putroñ ne ghāt kar ḍālne par bhī chaṛhkar nagar ko lūṭ liyā," "the sons of Jacob, *even*

after they had murdered [the inhabitants]"—as if it were, "not content with murdering them"—"attacked and sacked the city." Hence arises a frequent use of "par" when preceded by an infinitive, and followed by "bhī," in the sense of "though," *e.gr.* "bare bal se dabāye jāne par bhī wuh tumheñ jāne na degā," "even though he be constrained by great force, he will not let you go;" "yih bāt hazār bār sunne par bhī tum ne ab tak nahīñ mānī," "though you have heard this thing a thousand times, yet you have not yet believed it."

19. "Tak;" also "talak;" and in Hindi "loñ" and "le." All these words are synonymous with each other, and denote either (1) *duration* or *extent* of a space or of a time, or (2) the *end* of a space or of a period of time. *E.gr.* "maiñ ghanṭoñ tak baiṭhā rahā," "I sat for hours," and "maiñ do baje tak baiṭhā rahā," "I sat till two o'clock," are equally idiomatic; and in each case the context determines whether "tak" denotes the duration, or the termination, of the time of sitting. Similarly, "jal kosoñ tak phail gayā," "the water spread for miles," and "jal rājbhawan loñ phail gayā," "the water spread as far as the palace," are equally good, though in the one case "tak" or "loñ" denotes the extent of space, and in the other its limit.

Tak, etc.

20. These words express the extent, or the limit of the extent, not only literally of space or time, but of a class or classes into which the mind divides things; *e.gr.* "baran pashuoñ tak ke sab pahilauṭhoñ ko bhī mār ḍālā," "killed the firstlings even of beasts;" where the mind as it were looks at men and beasts as two separate territories spread out before its eye, and sees that the killing *extended as far as* the latter. And from this use of these words has sprung another; in

Also mental

which they are not used as postpositions at all (else they would modify the preceding noun, which they do not), but simply in the sense of "bhī." *E.gr.* "un kā ek khur loñ rah na jāegā," "not even a hoof of them shall stay behind" (where "kā" is not a mistake for "ke," else the verb would be without a subject).

21. When these words are joined with "jab," they always denote *duration* of time, *not* the end of it. In other words, "jab tak" never denotes "until," but always "while." This is the reason why, when we wish to express "until" as a conjunction, we must add "na" to "jab tak." "Sit here, *while* I pray yonder" is "jab tak maiñ udhar duʿā māngtā rahūñ, tum yahāñ baiṭhe raho;" but "Sit here *till* I have done praying" is "jab tak maiñ duʿā ko khatm *na* karūñ, tum yahāñ baiṭhe raho;" for "till" means "*as long as* the event or action does *not* take place."

With "jab"

22. Lastly, it should be observed that we often say "till" *not* in the above sense, but in the sense of "and at last;" and in such cases it should be rendered *not* by any of the words here treated of, but so as to convey its real meaning. *E.gr.* "they mocked the messengers of God.....*until* there was no remedy" does not mean that they went on doing so as long as there was a remedy, and after that they ceased; but that they went on doing so, *and eventually* they had sinned past repentance and remedy, "*aur ant meñ* bachne kā koī upāy na rahā." So, in the Confirmation Service, the prayer that the confirmee may "daily increase in Thy Holy Spirit *until* he come to Thine everlasting kingdom" does not mean to put a limit of time to his daily increase; and therefore should be

"At last"

rendered "wuh tere Rūhu'lquds ko roz ba roz ziyāda hāsil kartā jāe, *aur ākhir i kār* terī abadī bādshāhat meñ pahunche."

23. "Ne." We reserve what has to be said about the construction of this postposition with verbs, till we come to deal with the "tenses" of verbs.

"**Ne**" At present all that we need to say is, that this rather extraordinary construction ("by me the deed was done" instead of "I did the deed"), which obtains in the vernacular only of the *West* of Hindustan, but from it has spread into the literary and polite language of the whole area, is derived from a usage which came into Sanskrit in comparatively late times,—a sort of shy, roundabout way of saying things. Only, in Sanskrit it is used with all parts of the verb ("by him it is said" for "he says," as well as "by him it was said" for "he said,") but in Hindustani its use is limited to the past tenses.

CHAPTER V.

Compound Nouns.

By these we mean nouns which, while composed of a noun and some other word, are really in each case a single noun, and as such stand as subject or object in a sentence; the *latter* part of the compound noun *alone* undergoing any modification which its place in the sentence may require.

1. It is curious that, while Sanskrit possesses an unlimited power and liberty to form compound nouns—a power and liberty exceeding even those possessed by Greek and German—Hindustani has almost entirely lost it. Not, indeed, entirely; *e.gr.* it has the words "bheṛ-shālā," sheepfold; "lakhpati," an owner of lākhs (*i.e.* a very rich man); "lakaṛphoṛ," woodpecker; "panhārā," water-carrier; "dukhbharā," filled with sorrow; "bhūiñḍol," earthquake; "relgāṛī," rail-carriage, *i.e.* train; "jeb-ghaṛī," pocket-clock, *i.e.* watch. Some of these examples illustrate the fact, that the first part of a compound noun is often shortened; *e.gr.* "lakh" in "lakhpati," is shortened from "lākh;" "pan" in "panhārā" is for "pānī."

Power almost lost

2. Yet such words are, comparatively, very few, and may be compared with the French "colporteur," "bienfait," etc. On the whole the Hindustani, like the French, prefers the use of a postposition (preposition). As the French say "chemin de fer," "journal de travail," where we say "railroad," "Labour journal," so the Hindustanis say "sone kī ghaṛī" where we say "gold watch," "ūn kā kapṛā" where we say "woollen cloth," "pahinne kā kapṛā" for "wearing apparel," etc.

3. But though Hindustani has retained but little power to *form new* compound nouns, it borrows immense numbers of such compounds from the chief languages from which its vocabulary is derived, *viz.* Sanskrit and Persian. Of the former class, there are but few in common use in Hindustani; they are mostly used by Pandits. Some of them, however, have come into common use through political or other

Borrowed compounds

special causes; *e.gr.* "swadesh," one's "own country." On the other hand, very many of the Persian compounds have been thoroughly appropriated by ordinary Hindustanis; and this is, indeed, perhaps the greatest benefit which Persian has bestowed on Hindustani; for these compound words are for the most part, unlike the Sanskrit ones, easy for illiterate people to pronounce. And many of them have the further advantage of including Arabic words; for though Arabic is not a compound-forming language, its words may be, in Persian, compounded without limit with Persian words; and these have found a home in Hindustani.

Special rules

4. It is to be observed that when a Persian compound is formed by combining an adjective or noun or particle (*i.e.* indeclinable word) with a noun, the resultant is not a noun but an adjective (or, what comes to the same thing—see below—a concrete noun); and if one wants to form an abstract noun from it, one must add *ī*. *E.gr.* "dil" means "heart;" but "buzdil" does not mean "a faint heart" (or, a "faint-heart," used as a noun);—"buz" literally means "a sheep"—, but "faint-hearted;" and "a faint heart," or "faint-heartedness," is "buzdilī." So "bad" is "bad," and "kār" is "work;" but "badkār" does not mean "a bad work," but "an evil-doer;" and "evil-doing" is "badkārī." So "khud" is "self," and "kush" is "killing;" but "khudkush" is not "the act of killing oneself," but "a suicide," *i.e.* "one who kills himself;" and the act of suicide is "khudkushī." And if the second member of the compound is concrete, it must be turned into its corresponding abstract. *E.gr.* "ham" means "together," like "co" and "con," and "khādim" means "a minister;" but "a fellow-minister" is not "ham-khādim," but "ham-khidmat," literally "a fellow (in the) minis-

try." So "wāris" is an "heir;" but a "joint-heir" is not "hamwāris," but "ham-mīrās," "mīrās" being the word for "inheritance." Sanskrit compounds, on the other hand, do not follow this rule; *e.gr.* "swa" is "own," and "desh" is "country," and "own country" is "swadesh;" "saha" means "together," and "vās" is "dwelling" (an *abstract* noun), and the act of "dwelling together" is "sahavās." And the addition of ī to such words turns them into adjectives or concrete nouns, which is just the opposite of the above-mentioned rule for Persian compounds; *e.gr.* "swadeshī" means one's "own country-man;" "sahavāsī" means "a person who dwells with one."

CHAPTER VI.

ADJECTIVES.

Adjectives used as Nouns

1. Readers of the last chapter will have noticed that adjectives and concrete nouns are often classed together. There is, in fact, more difference observed in form in Hindustani between concrete and abstract nouns, than between nouns and adjectives. In other words, most adjectives can be used as concrete nouns, some nouns (*e.gr.* "ādmī") being understood; *e.gr.* "badkār" (see the last chapter) means properly "having bad works," but is used for "a person having bad works," *i.e.* "an

evil-doer." So "baṛā" is "great;" but in "apne baṛoñ kā hukm mānnā," "to obey one's superiors," it is used as a concrete noun (compare the English "one's betters"). On the other hand, no nouns, whether abstract or concrete, can be used as adjectives, *i.e.* made to qualify other nouns.

Comparison of Adjectives

2. Hindustani is a very poor language in the matter of comparison of Adjectives; which is remarkable, seeing that both Sanskrit and Persian express it as clearly as Greek, Latin or German. There are, indeed, some words, superlative in Sanskrit, and some others, comparative in Persian, which have come into Hindustani, but in it have entirely lost the superlative and comparative meanings. *E.gr.* "uttam" in Sanskrit means "best" (literally "outmost"), but in Hindi means simply "good." So "bihtar" in Persian means "better," but in Urdu only means "good." (Many Europeans, indeed, and Indians who imitate them, led by the similar sound of "better," use "bihtar" in a comparative sense; but this is not Hindustani idiom. Also missionaries have introduced the Persian superlative "pāktarīn," "holiest," into Christian Hindustani language; but this word will never take hold of the people in a superlative sense). This dropping of signs for the comparative and superlative arises perhaps from the same habit of mind as has led English people to use the superlative *form* where no comparison is intended, but only the fact that the quality is found in a pre-eminent degree; *e.gr.* "he was *most* kind to me" does not mean "kinder than all other people," but only "very kind," "extremely kind." In Hindustani, the comparative is commonly expressed by the positive form of the adjective, with a "se" attached to the word which expresses the thing with which comparison is

made; as "us se achchhā," "better *than* that." But when stress is desired to be laid on the comparison, and also when "se" is liable to be misinterpreted (see Chapter IV, section 11), "ziyāda" is added in Urdu—corrupted to "jāda" by the illiterate—, and "adhik" in literary Hindi. And, when there is still a chance of ambiguity, in the place of "se" "kī banisbat" is used in Urdu, and "kī apekshā" in Hindi. But these words, specially the latter, should be avoided whenever possible.

Varia

3. Some English adjectives have no exact equivalent in Hindustani. *E.gr.* "steep," if uphill, is "us meñ baṛī chaṛhāī hai," lit. "there is great mounting in it;" if downhill, us meñ baṛā utār hai," lit. "there is a great descent in it." Again, there is no special word for "short," as opposed to "long." "Chhoṭā" is the word used; but only the context can decide whether this means "short" or "narrow." A "chhoṭā rastā" may mean either!

CHAPTER VII.

The Adjectival Affixes "kā" and "wālā."

Really Adjectival

That these affixes are adjectival, is sufficiently proved by the fact that, like all adjectives which end in *ā*, they agree in gender and number with a following noun; *e.gr.* "hisāb kī kitāb," "account book," "daurnewāle bail," "running oxen."

This alone ought to be enough to check the use, so common among Europeans, and those Indians who associate much with them, of affixing "wālā" to an adjective; seeing that affixing an adjectival affix to an adjective is meaningless.

Like Possessive Pronouns

1. "Kā" is not a case-ending, as is often assumed; and though it does the work of a postposition, yet it differs from postpositions in being declined like an adjective. In fact, a noun with "kā" added to it stands in the same relation to the noun without the "kā," as possessive pronouns stand in to personal pronouns. A possessive pronoun means the same as the corresponding personal pronoun, only treated as an adjective (*i.e.* with the additional thought of "belonging to," "connected with"), and therefore declinable in all languages which admit of its declension. Thus, *if there was* such a combination as "mujh kā," it would mean the same as "merā:" if Hindustani *allowed* "tum kā," it would not differ in meaning from "tumhārā." And just the same may be said of "wālā."

Meaning very General

2. The relation indicated by both these affixes is a very general one. Our "of" is sufficiently comprehensive; but "kā" and "wālā," specially the former, are more so. *E.gr.* we say the Epistles *of* St. Paul," meaning that he wrote them, but "the Epistle *to* Timothy," meaning that it was addressed to him; but "muq. Paulus ke khatt and "Tīmuthiyus kā khatt" are equally good Hindustani; and the latter idiom is specially useful when one has to add other words, *e.gr.* "Romīoñ *ke* khatt ke pānchweñ bāb kī dūsrī āyat," "the second verse of the fifth chapter of the Epistle *to* the Romans."

This comprehensiveness of reference in "kā" probably arises from its origin. It comes from the Sanskrit "kār," "a work," or "effect;" hence any sort of way in which one thing is *affected* by another. The derivation of "wālā" is less certain. Some derive it from the Sanskrit adjectival affix "vala;" others, with more reason, from "pāla," "a keeper." * It is exceedingly common in the Panjab, as the ending of the names of places, either as "wālā" (*e.gr.* Gujranwālā), or as "wāl" *e.gr.* Nārowāl); the affix in every case signifying that the place was settled by the person or persons indicated by the first part of the name; as is done, in newly-settled English-speaking countries, by adding "'s" to the name of the first settler.

3. There is no real difference in meaning between these two affixes; only the use of the one is idiomatic in some cases, and that of the other in other cases. For instance, they are interchanged to avoid tautology; *e.gr.* "his stone house" *might* be "us kā patthar kā ghar," but "us kā pattharwālā ghar" is more idiomatic, because it sounds better. Again, "honewālā" and "hone kā" mean radically the same, *viz.* that something is going to happen; but "maiñ Musalmān hone kā nahīñ" means "I could not think of becoming a Musalman," whereas "honewālā" simply refers to the future. So "uddhār usī mrityu ke dwārā hone kā hai," "salvation can take place only by means of that death," expresses the meaning better than it would with "honewālā."

Meaning Identical

4. We have already said (Chapter VI) that (1) adjectives may be used as concrete nouns in Hindu-

* A very familiar example of the *p* in "pāla" being turned into *w* is "Gwālā," a cowherd, from "Gopāla," a cow-keeper.

stani, some other noun being understood; but (2) nouns cannot be used as adjectives. The former of these rules applies in full force to "kā" and "wālā," specially the latter; *e.gr.* the familiar nouns "roṭīwālā," "the bread-man," "jānewālā," "the goer;" "ādmī," or its equivalent, being understood. As regards the latter rule, we can say, with the same meaning, "a gold chain" (where "gold," though a noun, is treated as an adjective), and "a golden image," where "golden" is an adjective formed by adding the affix "en" to "gold." But in Hindustani the former usage is impossible; we cannot say "sonā tauq" any more than "sonā mūrat;" but must say "sone kā," or "sonewālā tauq," and "sone kī," or "sonewālī mūrat."

How used

5. Both these affixes—but chiefly "wālā"—are attached (1) to *nouns* which are easily recognized as nouns, *e.gr.* "āsmān kī bādshāhat," "the kingdom of heaven," "rupaiye-wālā," "a man with rupees," *i.e.* a rich man. This last example illustrates the rule, that as before postpositions nouns in *ā* change this vowel to *e*, so do they before "kā" and "wālā." (2) to *particles* used as nouns, *e.gr.* "ūparwālā," or "ūpar kā shahr," "the upper city," lit. "the city of the above;" "pahilewālā Itwār," the Sunday that comes first," "pahilewālā ādmī," the man that occupies the first place." ("Pahilāwālā ādmī" would be impossible, as "pahilā" is an adjective; "the first man" is "pahilā ādmī;" but "pahile" is an adverb, used here as a noun). (3) to *infinitives* of verbs; for the infinitive *is* a noun, *i.e.* the nominal part of the verb, and therefore used as subject or predicate in a sentence. These infinitives, which end in "nā," must change this to "ne" before the addition of "kā" or "wālā," *e.gr.* "jane kā," "karnewālā."

To what attached

6. The addition of "wālā" to an infinitive takes place for *four* reasons. (1) to denote habit or practice, *e.gr.* "jagat badalnewālā hai," "the world is changeable," or "is (always) changing;" "tez daurnewālā ūnṭ," "fast-running camel." (2) to indicate action at a certain time, *e.gr.* "he jānewālo, haṭo!" "Get out of the way, you that are going along there!" "tāki haikal meñ jānewāloñ se bhīkh māṅge," "that he might ask alms of those who were going into the temple." (3) to indicate action *before* that time; as Christ calls His Father His "bhejnewālā," His "sender," *i.e.* He who *had* sent him. And in Matt. 15: 38, those who *had* eaten are rightly called "khānewāle." In all these three cases, the infinitive with "wālā" very often takes the place of a relative clause (as in the above examples), and thus simplifies the sentence, which is a very important object in Hindustani. But in (2) and (3), this form must *not* be used when *stress* is laid upon either the contemporaneity or the precedence of the action referred to, for fear of ambiguity. (4) to express action in a *future* time, whether near, as "sūraj ugnewālā hai," "the sun is just going to rise;" or more distant, as "wuh ʿadālat ko ānewālā hai," "He is coming to judge." But this form cannot be used when *stress* is laid on the distance of the future action; or at least not without the addition of words signifying that distance.

Meanings of wala with Infinitive

7. There is a use of the word "of" in English, in which it must *not* be rendered by "kā." We speak of "the book of Exodus," "the city of Calcutta," etc. But "Khurūj" kī kitāb" and "Kalkatte kā shahr" are not Hindustani. They rather suggest the idea, that "Khurūj was the

"Of" not always "kā."

author, or is the possessor, of the book, and "Kalkattā" the king whose the city is. What is meant should be expressed by "Khurūj *nām* kitāb," "Kalkattā *nām* shahr."

8. We shall deal in Chapter XXI with "kā" when it comes between two similar words reduplicated (*e.gr.* "qaum kī qaum"); but now we must mention that it *also* comes between two words of the same *class*, but of which the first is relative, and the other of the simple third person. *E.gr.* "us kā hāth jaise kā taisā achchhā ho gayā, "his hand became well, just as it was before;" "we us ke pīchhe jyoñ ke tyoñ pare rahe," "they kept on persecuting him as they had done before."

"Kā" between Relative and 3rd Person

9. When a noun is qualified *both* by another noun followed by "kā" *and also* by an adjective, as a rule the former comes before the latter; *e.gr.* "a high wooden house" is "lakṛī kā ūnchā ghar," not "ūnchā lakṛi kā ghar;" "miṭṭī ke do bartan," "two earthenware vessels." The same is the case with a possessive pronoun; *e.gr.* "merā ūnchā ghar," "my high house;" "hamārī yih du'ā," "this our prayer." But where the noun, and the other noun with "kā," are regarded as *one thing*, the reverse is the rule; *e.gr.* "donoñ chā ke chamche," "both tea-spoons." And so, when "wālā" is used instead of "kā," it comes next to the noun which it qualifies; *e.gr.* "do miṭṭīwāle bartan," not "miṭṭīwāle do bartan."

CHAPTER VIII.

NUMERALS.

1. "Ek" does duty both for the numeral "one," and for the indefinite article "a" or "an" (words which themselves originally meant "one"); but Europeans are apt to use it in the latter sense much more than Hindustanis do. *E.gr.* we say "another," but Hindustanis never say "ek dūsrā," but simply "dūsrā;" only the context determining whether this means "another" or "the other." It is impossible to give rules which would cover all cases, showing when to use "ek" for "a" or "an," and when not; noticing how natives speak and write is the only sure way of learning in this, as in many other matters; but bearing in mind the above caution will be a help, by keeping one on one's guard against an unidiomatic use of "ek." There is, however, an idiomatic use of "ek," which has no parallel in English. When a person proposes to another to take some specified means for accomplishing a known object—as when the elders of the Jerusalem Church proposed to St. Paul to take under his wing four men who had a vow on them, so as to allay the prejudices of the Jews—, they say in Hindustani, "ek kām kar," and then proceed to say what they propose.

Use of Ek

2. There is a use of "one" in English, which has *no* parallel in Hindustani. We do not like leaving an adjective without a noun following; therefore, when it would be awkward to express the noun, we put

in "one" (though this is *not* a noun), to "fill up" the sentence, as we feel it. *E.gr.* when speaking of several things, we say "this one" or "that one," and *not* "this book" or "that shoe," when the person we are addressing knows that we are speaking of books or shoes. So, of two horses, we speak of "the bay one" or "the old one;" of several possible servants, we say we want "a clever one" or "an honest one." Now, in all such cases, Hindustanis insert neither "ek" nor any other word. If there is any doubt as to what is meant, they express the noun; otherwise, they leave the adjective unprotected, so to speak. *E.gr.* "this one" and "that one" would be, commonly, simply "yih" and "wuh;" if we want the bay horse and do not want the old one, we say "lāl ghoṛā chāhiye, purānā nahīñ chāhiye;" if we have certain servants before us, or in our mind's eye, we speak of one as "diyānatdār" and another as "hoshyār," simply. It is the more necessary to warn foreigners against supposing that "one" in such connexions must be represented by some Hindustani word, because they have already, by an unaccountable but inveterate error, adopted the adjectival affix "wālā," spoken of in the last chapter, for the purpose; and thus, by putting it after an adjective, violate the fundamental rule there stated, that, being an adjectival affix, it can never be attached to an adjective. And this extraordinary error has been learnt from English people by domestic servants, tradesmen, and others who come much into contact with English; which fact makes it all the more necessary for new-comers to be on their guard against acquiring this bad habit through imitation.

A reprehensible use

3. "Ek" after other numerals, and also after "kaī" ("several"), modifies the meaning of the other word.

Addition of "ek"

E.gr. "do ek" means "some two;" "bīs ek," "about 20;" "kaī ek," "several," but with the connotation of "not very many."

"Or" between numerals

4. Where we insert "or" between two numerals (*e.gr.* "two or three," "ten or twelve," "twenty or thirty," etc.), there Hindustanis insert nothing. Thus, "four or five" is "chār pānch;" "ten or twelve" is "das bārah," etc. But "unīs bīs" is used in the sense of "two things in which there is no practical difference," rather than "nineteen or twenty." And, while now the objection to say "do tīn" for "two or three" is very much less than it was, the influence of English having had great sway in this as in countless other matters, yet it is well to know that the uncorrupted (?) native passes over "three," and say "do chār" instead. This is due to a strange feature of the human mind, according to which what is first regarded as sacred comes to be looked upon as unlucky. The sacredness of the number "three" pervades all departments of thought in the Vedas, and so this feeling has survived among Hindus to this day, in the form of a fancy of ill-luck attaching to the utterance of that number.

Numerals from 11 to 99

5. All the numerals from 11 to 99, inclusive, present great difficulty to a foreigner, for he has to acquire them by a sheer effort of memory. This is because they are the result of what may be called a "squashing" of the Sanskrit numerals; which are as simple and natural as the English, *i.e.* are formed by combining the unit and the decade, *e.gr.* "twenty-one," "sixty-four," etc., only that in Sanskrit the unit comes first, something like the obsoles-

cent "one and twenty," "four and sixty." But by the "squashing" process, in the formation of the vernaculars from Sanskrit, certain elements of the original were retained, others were lost, and others again were altered. *E.gr.* 55 is in Sanskrit "panchapanchāshat," "pancha" being the word for "five," and "panchāshat" for 50; but the Hindustani is "pachpan," "pach" being all that remains of "pancha," and "pan" of "panchāshat." Again, 88 is in Sanskrit "ashṭāshīti," where "ashṭā" signifies "eight," and "ashīti" "eighty;" but it has become in Hindustani "aṭhāsī." The "un" which forms the first part of the ninth numeral in every decade except 89 and 99, is derived from the Sanskrit "ūna," which means "less;" or that "unīs" originally meant "twenty, less" (by one), "untālīs," "forty, less" (by one).* In Sanskrit, this way of forming the ninth numeral is an optional alternative, in every decade, with the regular method which combines the unit with the decade; and it is unknown why Hindustani has adopted the one method in every decade from 19 to 79, but the other in 89 and 99.

6. At first sight it seems strange that the *second* numeral in each decade begins, not with *d* (like "do"), but with *b*. But, really, *both* are derived from the Sanskrit for "two," *viz.* "dwi." Of this word, the unit "do" has retained the "d," and "bāīs," "battīs," "bayālīs," etc., have retained only the *w*, which has been hardened to *b* after the removal of the protecting *d*. Similarly, the Latin for "two" is "duo;" but for "twice" it is not "dis" as in Greek, but "bis."

7. To every numeral after "ek" may be appended the syllable "oñ." (In the case of "do," an *n* is inserted between the numeral and the affix; and in

* Compare "forty stripes save one."

some parts of Hindustan the affix appended to this numeral is not "oñ," but "o"). When added to any numeral short of 1,000, this syllable adds the idea of inclusiveness to that of the numeral. In English we reach the same result by prefixing "the" ("the four men," "the hundred gates," etc.); and, if we wish to emphasize it, we say "all the." Only in the case of the second numeral we more commonly employ a word devised for the purpose, *viz.* "both." Yet it is not enough to say, *e.gr.* that "the three" is "tīnoñ," "all the 24" is "chaubīsoñ," etc. For "oñ" is appended in many places, where we do *not* add "the," but "inclusiveness" is intended nevertheless. *E.gr.* "his three sons were killed in battle" is not "us ke tīn beṭe laṛāī meñ mare," which would mean "three of his sons were killed in battle," and would imply that he had others who were not killed; but "us ke *tīnoñ* beṭe laṛāī meñ mare." So, "my five houses are in ruins" is "mere pānchoñ ghar ujaṛ gaye haiñ;" "mere pānch ghar" would only mean "five of my houses." But when added to "hazār," a thousand, "lākh," a hundred thousand, and "karoṛ," ten million, "oñ" gives no inclusive meaning, but simply that of plurality; *e.gr.* "hazāroñ," thousands; "lākhoñ," hundreds of thousands; "karoṛoñ," "tens of millions." And this "oñ," though probably connected with the same syllable as affixed to the plurals of nouns when followed by postpositions, yet is added equally when followed, and when not followed, by postpositions.

The numeral affix "oñ"

8. These inclusive numerals, specially "donoñ," are idiomatically inserted where a foreigner sees no need of the insertion of any word *E.gr.* "the Father and the Son have but one substance," "Pitā aur

Idiomatic use

Putra donoñ kā ek hī tattwa hai;" "in happiness and in misery, be stedfast," "dukh sukh donoñ meñ sthir raho." Specially useful is this idiom to express what we express by "both.....and." *E.gr.* "both Hinduism and Christianity acknowledge incarnations," "Hindū aur Masīhī donoñ dharmoñ meñ awatār māne jāte haiñ;" "praise God both morning and evening," "subh aur shām donoñ waqtoñ meñ Khudā kī hamd karnā."

A local difference

9. There is a difference of idiom between the east and the west of Hindustan, in reference to the use or non-use of the plural number in adjectives and verbs, when joined with numerals. In the east they say "tīn bāt kā varnan," "an account of three things;" but in the west they say "tīn bātoñ kā varnan." However, even in the east this usage is by no means applied to all cases; and therefore the foreigner is safer, even there, if he begins by always using the plural with numerals, and then gradually learns by experience *where* the people do not use it.

One another

10. "One another" is in Hindustani "ek dūsre," with the appropriate postposition following. In other words, "dūsre" is modified, but "ek" is, usually, left unmodified. *E.gr.* "unhoñ ne ek dūsre kī ta'rīf kīī," "they praised one another; "ham ek dūsre se prem rakkheñ," "let us love one another."

CHAPTER IX.

The Adjectival Affix "Sā."

1. This affiix signifies *likeness*, and seems to be abbreviated from the Sanskrit "sama," which is our "same;" the notion of identity easily passing into that of similarity, which is identity in one or more particulars, though not in all. It enables Hindustani to express likeness in a very conveniently succinct way. Not that it will always do instead of "ke samān" in Hindī, or "kī mānind" in Urdu; but very often it will be not only a shorter, but also a more idiomatic, way of saying the same thing. And generally, where we say "as it were," "so to speak," etc., this affix will be found to answer. *E.gr.* "yih mez merī sī hai," "this table is like mine;" "āp kā chihra āp ke bāp kā sā hai," "your face is like that of your father." Here, if we used "samān" or "mānind," we should have to repeat the words "mez" and "chihra;" for Hindustani has no device corresponding to the use of "that" in the second of these examples. (See Chap. X, 8). When joined with words denoting *colour*, "sā" answers to the English affix "ish;" *e.gr.* "ujlī sī sūjan," "a whitish swelling."

Signifies Likeness

2. Hindustanis, being much more matter-of-fact than Europeans (see Chap. XXXIV), cannot state their meaning as boldly (or baldly) as the latter do, without fear of misunderstanding; but the affix "sā" comes in very

Inserted for ease

conveniently to save the situation. *E.gr.* we might in English say of Napoleon Buonaparte, that he "was God's sword," but we cannot say in Hindustani, "wuh Khudā kī talwār thā." If, however, we insert "sā" after "talwār," we say what is quite intelligible and idiomatic. So again, we say that a king ought to *be* a *shepherd* of his people, but because this is not literally true, a Hindustani would say, "Rājā ko apnī prajā kā charwāhā *sā* honā chāhiye."

How connected

3. The affix "sā" is affixed to nouns without any postposition intervening; and nouns are not modified before it; *e.gr.* in the last example, it is not "charwāhe sā" (as it would be before "kā" and "wālā"), but "charwāhā sā." Personal pronouns, however, before "sā" take the form which they take before postpositions; *e.gr.* "mujh sā pāpī," "a sinner such as I am;" "tujh sā koī sāmarthī nahīñ," "there is no one mighty like Thee." Those who read old translations made by foreigners should be on their guard against a strange idiom of theirs, *viz.* inserting "kā" before "sā" without any of the meaning of "kā." *E.gr.* "wuh bādshāh kā sā hai," in the sense of "he is like a king," is wrong; but "wuh bādshāh kā sā kām kartā hai," "he acts like a king" (lit. "he does work like that of a king"), is right.

Imitation

4. Here it may be observed, that this affix is specially useful when one wishes to speak of "imitating" another, "following his example," etc. For there is no Hindustani word in *common* use, which means "to imitate;" and "namūna" is wrongly used by Christians of an "example" set by any one; it means "a sample" rather than an "example." But "Masīh kī sī chāl chalnā" exactly, and neatly, expresses what we mean

by "following the example of Christ." Literally, it is "walking a walk like that of Christ."

5. Besides all this, there are certain adjectives, to which "sā" is appended without in any degree altering the meaning of the adjective; only "sā" makes them run more smoothly and elegantly. They are "baṛā," "chhoṭā," "bahut," "thoṛā," and "kaun." There is no difference in meaning between "ek baṛī hawelī" and "ek baṛī sī hawelī," "a big mansion;" between "bahut log" and "bahut se log," "many people;" or between "in meñ se kaun ādmī mazbūt haiñ" and "in meñ se kaun se ādmī mazbūt haiñ," "which of these men are strong?"; but the latter in each case is generally more elegant. But in all these cases, "sā" originally had the meaning of likeness, but has lost it. Similarly, the English "which" is formed from "what-like;" but has now lost all idea of likeness; it merely identifies a particular person or thing. So, in the ordinary village speech of many parts of England, "like" is added to words without any thought of the proper meaning of this adjective, simply from a feeling that they do not wish to be too positive. And, no doubt, it was this *modesty* (or politeness) which originated, in Hindustani also, this use of "sā."

Real meaning lost

CHAPTER X.

Personal Pronouns.

First Person

1. In the literary and polite language, "maiñ" is the first person singular pronoun used throughout Hindustan; but in the common language of the people, it is so only in the western half of it. In the eastern, "ham" is used for the singular as well as the plural; and when a person uses it for himself alone, it connotes neither pride nor any other unseemly feeling, as the foreigner is apt to think.

Second Person

2. "Tū," and the second person singular of verbs also, are used by Hindustanis in general in two ways, *viz.* (1) in contempt; *e.gr.* in addressing an animal, or a man whom one wishes to treat contemptuously; and (2) in endearment; *e.gr.* in addressing children, or an adult if extremely near to and familiar with the speaker. But besides these two uses, Muhammadans, and Christians after them, employ it in addressing God, whereas Hindus use the plural "tum" in addressing the objects of their worship. The reason which weighs with Muhammadans and Christians is the transcendence of God, *i.e.* the fact that He is above and beyond all our devices for honouring Him, and expressing His greatness, and therefore it is best to use the simplest language possible in addressing, or speaking of, Him. In Hinduism, on the other hand, there is no *essential* difference between the divine and the human; it is only a difference of degree.

3. "Maiñ" becomes "mujh," and "tū" becomes "tujh," before every postposition except "ne;" before it, with one exception, they remain unchanged. That exception is that when another word, or other words, come between the pronoun and the postposition, "maiñ" becomes "mujh," and "tū" "tujh." *E.gr.* "mujh Paulus ne aisā hī likhā hai," "I Paul have written thus;" "Tujh mere Khudā ne yih waʿda kiyā hai," "Thou, who art my God, hast promised this."

Changes of "Maiñ and "Tū"

Personal pronouns of the first and second persons, in both numbers, have special forms as substitutes for the addition of "ko" to themselves, with *no* difference of meaning. Thus "mujhe" means the same as "mujh ko;" "tujhe," as "tujh ko;" "hameñ" as "ham ko;" and "tumheñ" as "tum ko." And these extra forms are specially useful to *avoid tautology* in a sentence.

Substitutes for "ko"

4. It is remarkable that, in parts of the world as far apart as Europe and Indja, while in the ancient languages the second person singular pronoun was always used in addressing a single person, yet the modern languages have adopted the second *plural* in most cases. Perhaps Arabic is the only very widely spoken language that still keeps to the singular; which well accords with the roughness of the Arabic character. Why the plural should be felt to be more honorific than the singular, it would not be so easy to say; but it is evident that politeness was the motive for the change.

Use of Plural

5. Many modern languages, however, including Hindustani, are not satisfied with the politeness

expressed by the plural of the second person. In addressing those whom they regard as equal, or superior, to themselves, they use a noun with a *third* person verb, some in the singular and some in the plural. In English this custom is only occasionally observed, *e.gr.* "your majesty," "your lordship," "your honour," "your reverence," and so on. In French it is the same. But in German, an equal or superior person is always addressed as "they" with the verb in the third person plural. In Italian, because all the words like "majesty" etc., are feminine singular, an equal or superior person is addressed as "she," "her." In later Sanskrit, a word which seems to have been originally a present participle meaning "becoming" came to be used, often in the plural but generally in the singular, for this purpose. The Hindustani "āp" is not derived from this word, but from "ātman;" which, though in Hindi it is used only for "soul," yet originally meant "self;" and at some period in the evolution of the language it must have been felt more polite to address another as "(your) self" than simply as "you." Anyhow, those who aspire to speak Hindustani correctly never address any but servants, and others in a position of *distinct* inferiority and subordination to themselves—*e.gr.* pupils in a school—by the word "tum," but always by "āp," with a plural adjective, and plural third person verb, attached. This custom, however, has but slightly made its way among the village population; and a foreigner should never think a villager disrespectful because he addresses him with "tum" instead of "āp," unless he knows that he is familiar with polite language. There are other expressions which go beyond "āp" in politeness, such as "janāb" (an Arabic word literally meaning "side") and "huzūr" (an Arabic word literally meaning "presence"). These are, naturally, more used in Urdu

Honorific terms

than in Hindi; though the latter, modified according to the genius of the language into "hajūr," is very commonly used by servants, beggars, etc.

No Gender

6. Personal pronouns undergo no change of form to express gender in Hindustani; and *that* not only, as in other Aryan languages, in the first and second persons, but even in the third. In this, Hindustani is the opposite of English; which while having no distinction of gender in adjectives—and in only a few nouns either—, yet clearly distinguishes between "he," "she," and "it." But Hindustani knows no distinction of this kind. However, it is only seldom that this causes any ambiguity; generally, the adjective or verb shows clearly enough whether a masculine or feminine person or thing is intended.

Absence of simple Third Person Pronoun

7. There is no simple third person pronoun universally recognized in Hindustani; *i.e.* there is none which simply expresses the third person (as "he," "she," and "it" do) without the additional thought of nearness or remoteness. Hindi, indeed, has the word "so;" but even in Hindi this word is, unhappily, obsolescent, and its use is mainly confined to correlatives, *i.e.* as corresponding to the relative "jo." And if "so" is obsolescent, the form "tis" which it assumes before postpositions ("tis par," etc.) is *obsolete*, even in Hindi. Urdu will have none of it, either "so" or "tis." Instead of these words, Urdu always, and Hindi increasingly, use the demonstrative pronouns "yih" (or "yah") and "wuh" (or "wah"); the former of which indicates nearness to the speaker, and corresponds to "this;" and the latter denotes remoteness, and answers to "that." Both of them are

used both as adjectives and as nouns. See further in Chapter XXIV.

8. But if "yih" and "wuh" have taken the place of the simple third person pronoun, the question occurs, *which* of them should be used in that sense? Foreigners generally assume, that the Hindustani word corresponding to "he," "she," or "it" is "wuh," not "yih." But this is a mistake. Probably it would be correct to say that Hindustanis, in saying "yih" or "wuh," have in every case a more or less conscious feeling that the person or thing spoken of is either near or remote; and use the one or the other accordingly. But anyhow, the following rules will help the foreign student:—

Substitutes for "it"

(1) "Yih" should be used when the object is near the speaker *even in thought. E.gr.* when Christ commanded His disciples not to tell any one that He was the Christ, He would have said in Hindustani, "kisī ko na batānā ki *yih* Masīh hai," because those who might be talking or thinking of Him would *have Him present* in their minds. So again, when the disciples asked Him why they could not expel the demon, they would have said, "ham *is* ko kyūñ na nikāl sake?" Here, though in English we should say "him" or "it," yet the demon is assumed to be the subject of conversation; and therefore "is," not "us," is used.

Proximity in thought

(2) When "he," "she," or "it" refers to an object *already* referred to as "yih," all subsequent references to the same object, in the same sentence, must contain "yih," not "wuh." This is the chief point in which foreigners are liable to err in their use of these words; for in all such cases we use the simple third person

Same repeated

pronoun. *E.gr.* we say "this land lies before you, so settle and traffic in *it*, and get possessions in *it*;" but the Hindustani is "yih desh tumhāre sāmhne paṛā hai, so *is* meñ bās karke len den karo, aur *is* meñ kī bhūmi nij kar lo." Again, "let this man and *his* wife and children, and all that *he* has, be sold" is the English; but the Hindustani is "yih, aur *is* kī jorū bachche, aur jo kuchh *is* kā hai, sab bechā jāe."

(3) As often in English, "yih" is used for "the latter," when two things are mentioned, and it is important to distinguish the two.

"The latter"

E.gr. "ek sau hāth lambe parde hoñ, aur un ke bīs khambhe, aur *in* kī bīs chūliyāñ hoñ," "let there be hangings a hundred cubits long, and their twenty pillars, and twenty sockets for these;" where, if "un" had been repeated, and not superseded by "in," it would have been doubtful whether the sockets were for the hangings, or for the pillars. But this use of "yih" is not nearly so frequent as that of "the latter" in English; it occurs only to prevent ambiguity; and very often it is better to repeat the noun meant.

9. There is an idiomatic English use of "that," where the pronoun stands for a noun which has already occurred; *e.gr.* "If the father's life was a sad one, *that* of the son was much sadder;" "Mr. Jones' sermons are long, but *those* of Mr. Smith are far longer." But in all such cases Hindustani *cannot use a pronoun, but must repeat the noun.*

English "that"

10. In Hindustani which is now entirely obsolete, "oñ" or "hoñ" was added to personal pronouns, in the plural number, before all post-positions; *e.gr.* "hamoñ se," "tumhoñ ko," "inhoñ meñ," "unhoñ

Addition of "oñ" or "hoñ"

ne." *Now*, this appendage occurs *only* in the case of "yih" and "wuh," and *that* only before "ne;" *e.gr.* "unhoñ ne" above.

11. In European languages, when one speaks of oneself along with others, it is considered polite to mention oneself *last;* and specially, to use the *second* person before the first. But this is *not* the rule in Hindustani. *E.gr.* "merā beṭā, and āp ke beṭe, wahāñ ekaṭṭhe gaye the," "your sons, and my son, went there together." There is no want of politeness in such a sentence. On the contrary, it is the idiom.

First Person first

CHAPTER XI.

Possessive Pronouns.

1. In the third person, "kā" is added, as it is to nouns, to express "possession;" *e.gr.* "us kā," "āp kā." But in the first and second persons, the same word "kār" was added as was, in the case of nouns, abbreviated to "kā" (see Chap. VII, para. 2); only, whereas in the case of nouns the *beginning* of "kār" was retained, in pronouns of the first and second person the *end* alone remained, *viz.* "ār;" which in literary Hindustani has had an *ā* added, which is declined like any adjective in *ā;* and besides this, in the singular number the *ā* of "ār" is modified to *e*. Thus we get the forms "merā," "terā," "hamārā," "tumhārā."

Of the Third Persons

2. Besidese these possessive pronouns, Hindustani has another, a *reflexive* one, not limited in use, like the Latin "suus," to the third person, but belonging equally to all three persons, and both numbers. This is "apnā," which is derived from "āp," "self;" and its use is, as a general rule, *obligatory when the noun which it qualifies refers to the subject of the sentence or clause.* In English, we often add "own" in this reflexive sense, whether for emphasis (*e.gr.* "every man magnifies his own merits"), or to avoid ambiguity (*e.gr.* "after teaching them, they went to their own homes"); but "apnā" must be used in Hindustani when the above rule applies, whether "own" be added in English, or not. *E.gr.* "maiñ apne ghar meñ rahtā hūñ," "I live in my house;" "ham apnī apnī kitāb dekh rahe haiñ," "we are reading our books;" "apne apne mā bāp kā hukm mānā karo," "obey your parents." If, in these sentences, emphasis is meant to attach to the possessive pronoun, "hī" is added to "apnā;" *e.gr.* "maiñ apne hī ghar meñ rahtā hūñ," "I live in my own house," *i.e.* not in another.

Apnā

3. Yet there are several kinds of exception to this rule; and in some cases it is very difficult, if not impossible, for a foreigner to decide certainly whether to use "apnā," or another possessive pronoun.

Exceptions

(1) Though the subject of the sentence, and the possessive pronoun, be of the same person, yet if they are not in the same number, "apnā" cannot be used, but the sense must be given in some other way. *E.gr.* "I believe in Jesus Christ our Lord" cannot be rendered "maiñ apne Khudāwand Yeshū' Masīh par īmān rakhtā hūñ," else it would mean "I believe in *my* Lord Jesus Christ;" but must be

Difference of Number

translated "maiñ Yeshū' Masīh par, jo hamārā Khudāwand hai, īmān rakhtā hūñ."

Reference to Object

(2) In "us ne Hananyāh nām ek ādmī ko andar āte and apne ūpar hāth rakhte dekhā hai," "he has seen a man named Hananiah coming in and putting his hands on him," the rule is observed, because the person on whom hands were laid is the subject of the sentence; and also because no reader would be likely to think it meant that Hananiah laid his hands on his *own* head! But in "us ne aur do bhāiyoñ ko *apne* bāp Zabdī ke sāth kashtī par *apne* jāloñ kī marammat karte dekhā," "he saw two other brothers mending their nets in the boat with their father Zebedee," the "apne" does *not* refer to the subject of the sentence, but to its *object*, *viz.* the two brothers. Yet there is no ambiguity here; and therefore "apne" is not only allowable, but idiomatic; "un ke" would here be quite unidiomatic. Probably the reason for this is, that if the sentence was turned in this way, "us ne aur do bhāiyoñ ko dekhā, *jo* apne bāp Zabdī ke sāth kashtī par apne jāloñ kī marammat *kar rahe* the," the meaning would be the same, and the sentence quite regular. A similar sentence is "Murdoñ ko apne murde dafn karne de," "let the dead bury their dead." Here, again, there is no ambiguity; for no one could think the meaning to be "do you let the dead bury *your* dead." In the above examples, "apnā" is used according to the *sense*, though not strictly according to rule. Another good example of this is "mujhe āj ke din apne aparādh chet āte haiñ," "my faults come to my mind this day." Here "apne" refers, *not* to the subject, "aparādh," but to the *object*, "mujhe." Yet the *meaning* is the same as if it was "maiñ apne aparādh smaraṇ kartā hūñ," "I remember my faults;" in which case "apne" would be according to rule. In the current Urdu version of Psalm 146:

41, "jis kā tawakkul Khudāwand *us* ke Khudā par hai," the "us ke," instead of "apne," is technically right, but idiomatically wrong; for that clause means the same as "jo Khudāwand *apne* Khudā par tawakkul rakhtā hai."

(3) When the noun to which "apnā" is attached is in the plural, and the possessive pronoun is therefore repeated, the danger of ambiguity is greatly lessened, and therefore "apnā" can be used without scruple. *E.gr.* "unheñ apne apne nagar meñ paiṭhne na do," "do not let them enter into their cities."

When repeated

(4) "Apnā" can be *added* to another possessive pronoun (or, what is the same thing, the third person pronoun with "kā" added), like our "own," to emphasize the person referred to. *E.gr.* "us ke apnoñ ne use qubūl na kiyā," "his own people received him not;" "hamārā apnā apnā cholā aur bhūmi chhoṛke aur kuchh nahiñ rahā," "we have nothing left except our own bodies and lands." And in conversation (where the look and tone preclude ambiguity much more than is possible in writing), the other possessive pronoun may be omitted; *e.gr.* "yih apnā ghar hai," "this is my own house," "merā" being understood.

Added to another

4. The Hindustani use of "apnā" is by no means an unmixed blessing. Certainly, it often enables a sentence to be put very neatly; but on the other hand, it often causes great perplexity. *E.gr.* in the old version of a clause in the Litany, "Deliver us from hardness of heart and contempt of Thy word" was rendered "Dil kī sakhtī aur apne kalām ke ḥaqīr jānne se hameñ bachā;" but this might just as well, if not rather, mean "deliver us from despising *our own* word." Hence, many preferred to read "tere" for

Ambiguity

"apne;" but this, again, was felt to be doubtful idiom. In making the last version, it was perceived that the cause of the trouble was the use of a *verb* ("ḥaqīr jānnā," "to despise"); and so a *noun* (as in English) took its place; and it now stands "apne kalām kī *taḥqīr* se hameñ bachā."

CHAPTER XII.

Verbs—General Remarks.

1. Many intransitive verbs in English denote both a momentary act, and also the state initiated by that act; *e.gr.* "to sit" means both "to take one's seat" and also "to continue in a sitting posture;" "to stand" means both "to assume a standing position" and also "to remain in that position." But, with few exceptions, this is not so in Hindustani. "Baiṭhnā" means only the act of sitting down, "khaṛā honā" only the act of standing up. "He sat for three hours" is not "wuh tīn ghanṭoñ tak baiṭhā," but "baiṭhā rahā." "The servant stands before his master" is not "Naukar apne mālik ke sāmhne khaṛā hotā hai," but "khaṛā rahtā hai." In an old version of Psalm 123: 1, "O Thou that sittest in the heavens" was rendered "Ai āsmān par baiṭhnewāle!", which can only mean "O Thou who art *in the habit* of taking Thy seat in

Act and State

heaven!" It should be "baiṭhe hue," "seated." So in Psalm 110: 1, "Sit Thou at my right hand" should be, not "merī dahinī taraf baiṭh," but "baiṭhā rah," because the following clause shows that the writer thought of a *period during* which the sitting posture should continue. So again, "to ride in a chariot" is *either* "rath par charhnā" (or "sawār honā"), *or* "rath par charhā rahnā" (or "sawār rahnā"), according as the meaning is the act of getting into the chariot (as we say), or the state of remaining in it.

There are some few exceptions to the above rule. *E.gr.* the verb "sonā," "to sleep." It is equally good to say "so jāo" for "go to sleep," and "wuh sotā hai" for "he is asleep." Similarly "jāgnā" means both "to wake up" and "to be awake." "Basnā" properly denotes the act of sitting in a place, and "to remain settled" should be "basā rahnā;" but the simple form is often used to convey the latter meaning also.

Exceptions

2. Many English verbs, which properly have an active meaning, are used *also* in a passive or neuter sense; *e.gr.* "to look" commonly denotes an act, but in "you look well" it means "to appear, on being looked at." So, "to sell" is commonly an act; but in "this ought to sell well" we mean "to fetch a price when sold." Similarly, we say "to smell a rose" and also "the rose smells sweet." But this double use of the same verb is *not* permissible in Hindustani. "You look well" is "Tum tandurust dekh *paṛte* ho;" "this ought to sell well" is "chāhiye ki yih achchhī tarah se *bike*," not "beche;" "the rose smells sweet" is "gulāb khushbūdār hai."

Active not used as Neuter

3. (1) By "*compound verbs*" we mean those combinations of verbs, in which the first is a bare root, and only the second is inflected. *E.gr.* in "rah jānā," "to remain behind," "rah" remains uninflected, while "jānā" alters its form according to tense, number, person, etc. ("chalā jānā," on the contrary, is *not* a compound verb, because "chalā" is inflected according to gender, number, etc). Many of these "compound verbs" show clearly, by their use, that the first part of the compound was originally a conjunctive participle; *e.gr.* "dab marnā," "to be crushed to death," lit. "having been crushed, to die;" "jal marnā," "to be burnt to death," lit. "having been burnt, to die." Yet, originally, there were *no* compound verbs in this sense; for it is only in the polite and literary form of Hindustani that the first verb appears in its bare root form. In the real vernacular of the greater part of Hindustan, the first verb has a short *i* attached to it, *e.gr.* "apnā kām kari āo," "do your work and come," "maiñ ghar hoy āūngā," "I will just go home and come." This *i* is the affix of the so-called conjunctive participle, of which more hereafter. And it is used, in the vernacular of most parts of Hindustan, and also in Bengali, even where it is difficult for us to see any idea of sequence of action. *E.gr.* in the above sentences it is plain that there is a sequence; the coming is regarded as *subsequent* to the doing one's work, or going home; but in "rah jānā," also given above, it does not *seem to us* that *going* (jānā) is subsequent to *remaining* (rahnā). However, this must have been the idea in the minds of those who first started, and adopted, this idiom.

Compound Verbs

In this section we are *not* treating of compound verbs whose second member is "uṭhnā," "baiṭhnā," "saknā," "pānā," or "rahnā;" which will be dealt with in Chapter XVI, Sections 11, 14, 18, 19.

(2) In many cases the second verb has apparently lost its proper meaning, or at least has retained it so slightly as to be hardly perceptible. (A striking example of this is a compound verb "ā jānā," where the literal meanings of the two parts are mutually contradictory. Yet it is constantly used with no sense of incongruity; *e.gr.* "wah ā gayā," "is *come*," *i.e.* "arrived.") The verbs to which this remark applies more than to others are "jānā," "parnā," "denā," "lenā," and "ḍālnā;" of these, "jānā" follows only intransitive verbs (see below, however); "parnā" follows both, transitive and intransitive verbs; "denā" and "lenā" follow both, but transitives much more than intransitives; and "ḍālnā" only follows transitives.

Second Verb's meaning obscure

(3) When the proper meaning of "jānā," *viz.* "to go," or "to go away," is evident, then it can follow transitive verbs equally well as intransitives; *e.gr.* "yih kar jāo," "do this and go," where "kar" is plainly the conjunctive participle, "i" having fallen off from its end (see above). But when "jānā" only intensifies the action denoted by the first verb, this first verb can only be an intransitive one. *E.gr.* "rahnā" means "to remain," but "rah jānā" "to remain behind." "Honā" means "to become" (see Chap. XVI, section 1); but because in many cases this meaning is weakened down to "to be," therefore "ho jānā" is used to emphasize the idea of "becoming." "Marnā" means "to die;" but "mar jānā" is more commonly used, to convey the meaning of "to be dead and gone." In all these cases, one can see why "jānā" was originally added; for "to go away after doing" anything implies that one has done it thoroughly. But this idea is not now present to those who use "jānā" in this way.

Jānā as Second Verb

Denā and lenā as Second Verbs

(4) "Denā" and "lenā" also intensify the meaning of the first verb; but their own special meanings are more apparent than is that of "jānā." When "denā" is added to another verb, it shows that the action, denoted by that verb, is viewed as *passing over* to its *object;* when "lenā" is added, it connotes a *return* of that action, or of its consequences, to the *agent*. *E.gr.* "Tū ne khud kah diyā," "thou thyself hast said [so]." Here the "diyā" intensifies the fact of "saying;" but besides this, it shows that the saying was directed to our Lord (Luke 23: 3). Again, "Badlī ne use un kī nazaroñ se chhipā liyā," "a cloud hid Him from their sight." Here the "liyā" expresses the idea, that the cloud hid Him by receiving Him *into itself*. Similarly when the first verb is intransitive; *e.gr.* "jo koī sune so mere kāran hañs degā," "whoever hears it will laugh *outright* because of me." Thus "degā" intensifies "hañsnā;" but it *also* conveys the idea, that the laughing will in some way affect those who hear it. Again, "wuh chal diyā," "he went right away," is stronger than "wuh chalā," and even than "wuh chalā gayā." So, "un kī ye bāteñ sunkar Yūsuph ro diyā," "hearing these words of theirs, Joseph burst into tears," which is more than "royā," "he wept." Thus, "baiṭh lījiye," which exactly corresponds with our "take a seat," is both more polite than "baiṭhiye," and also conveys the idea of *taking* the seat for oneself. And "jā lenā" and "ā lenā" mean "*to overtake;*" the former when the overtaker is going farther from the speaker, the latter when he is coming nearer to him; literally, "to go and take," "to come and take." Once more, "ho lenā" means "to start on a road;" the "honā" conveying the notion of "coming to be" on the road, and "lenā" adding to this notion that of a mental determination to pursue that road. "Lenā," in many

cases, adds to the idea of the first verb that of *success*. *E.gr.* "sunnā" means "to hear;" but "sun lenā" goes beyond mere hearing, and means to receive a petition favorably, *i.e.* to grant it. Again, "Shaitān ne tumheñ māng liyā" means that Satan had not only asked for the Apostles, but his request was successful, *i.e.* they were, to a certain extent, made over to him. There are some verbs which are either transitive or intransitive, according to the context; but the addition of "denā" makes them transitive, and that of "jānā" shows them to be intransitive. *E.gr.* "ghabrānā" may mean either to worry oneself, or to worry another person; but "ghabrā jānā" can only mean the former, and "ghabrā denā" can mean only the latter. Lastly, there is a curious phrase "dikhāī denā," "to appear," lit. "to present an appearance;" which is *treated as* a compound verb, and *intransitive*. *E.gr.* "Moses and Elijah appeared to them" is *not* "Mūsā aur Eliyyāh *ne* unheñ dikhāī *dīī*," but "Mūsā aur Eliyyāh unheñ dikhāī *diye*."

Ḍālnā as Second Verb

(5) "Ḍālnā" means to "throw;" and as we throw away a thing only when we have done with it, so the addition of "ḍālnā" intensifies the meaning of the first verb. *E.gr.* "khānā" means "to eat;" but "to eat up" is "khā ḍālnā." Again, "marnā" is "to die," and therefore "mārnā" should only mean "to kill;" but it has come to mean "to strike," and therefore, to express the meaning of killing, "mār ḍālnā" is used. "Paṛnā" means "to fall;" but as this radical meaning branches out into a great number of uses when "paṛnā" is the second member of a compound verb, we reserve the discussion of it for a section to itself (see Chap. XVI, section 5).

4. (1) In very many cases, Urdu and literary Hindi (see Chap. I.) tend to avoid simple verbs, and

employ instead a *noun* with "karnā" if a transitive verb is meant, and "honā" if an intransitive. Urdu was, in a way, compelled to do this, if it did not transplant Persian verbs bodily into Hindustani; and literary Hindi does it, because it affects Sanskrit (*i.e.* Tatsama) words. *E.gr.* "to rise," said of the sun or other heavenly body, is "ugnā;" but Urdu prefers "tulūʿ honā," and literary Hindi prefers "uday honā." "To tell" a person a thing is "batānā;" but Urdu says "bayān karnā," and Hindi "varnan karnā," in preference. "To be born," or "to spring up" (*e.gr.* in the mind), is "upajnā;" but Urdu uses "paidā honā," and Hindi "utpann honā," rather than "upajnā." The simple Hindustani for "to become acquainted with" a thing, "to come to know" it, is "[use] jān lenā;" but Urdu prefers to say "[us se] wāqif ho jānā." This usage saves foreigners a great deal of trouble in learning Hindustani; but it keeps them in comparative ignorance of the almost boundless wealth, which Hindustani possesses, in simple verbs.

Resolution of Verbs

(2) In these collocations of nouns with "karnā" to express a simple thought, the noun is in some cases connected with the verb as its direct object (with or without "ko") and in other cases the adjectival affix "kā" is interposed. *E.gr.* "to exhort a person" is "kisī *ko* nasīhat karnā;" but "to praise a person" is "kisī *kī* taʿrīf karnā;" while "to expound a subject" is either "kisī bāt *kā* bayān karnā" or "kisī bāt *ko* bayān karnā."

5. As regards the questions, what number a verb should take when it has more than one subject, and what person or gender it should take when those subjects are of divers persons or genders; no hard and fast rule can be laid down, for native authorities differ. In general, however, it may be said that

(1) when the subjects of the verb are regarded as quite different, the verb should be in the plural, *e.gr.* "Paulus aur Bar-Nabā bayān karne *lage*," "Paul and Barnabas began to discourse;" but (2) when they are closely related to each other, either as different words for the same thing, or of nearly the same meaning, or as parts of the same whole, or members of the same series, or in any way are regarded as a unit, then the verb is in the singular, *e.gr.* "zulm aur zabardastī Masīhīoñ ke nālāiq *hai*," "oppression and high-handedness are (lit. "is") unworthy of Christians;" (3) generally the verb takes the gender and number of the *last* subject, *e.gr.* "purush aur striyāñ ā *rahī* haiñ," "men and women are coming;" "tum aur tumhārā bhāī kyā ḍhūnḍhte haiñ?" "what are you and your brother seeking?" but (4) often the "predominant sex" usurps the influence on the verb, which would otherwise be given to the last subject. (5) When "donoñ" or "sab" are inserted between the subject and the verb, there is no question but that the verb should be in the plural.

CHAPTER XIII.

Neuter and Causal Verbs.

1. In most languages, quite as many verbal roots have a transitive meaning as an intransitive. This is the case in Sanskrit also; but in the modern languages derived from it, while there *are* a number of transitive verbal roots, yet the tendency is to have the

Hindustani treats Neuter as Original

roots intransitive, and to form from them causal verbs with a transitive meaning. *E.gr.* in English "make" is a verbal root, with a transitive meaning; but in Hindustani the root "ban" is intransitive, and means "to come into a made state;" and the idea of "making" must be expressed by a causal formed from it, *viz.* "banānā." One cannot be sure of the cause of this reversal of ideas, which seems to us so strange, and which has only sprung up in comparatively modern times; but it is probably connected with the Pantheism which is ingrained in the minds of Hindus, according to which voluntary agency, while not generally denied, is relegated to an inferior place in their thought, and the events, which we call actions, are, along with those which do *not* depend on human agency, regarded as *coming* to be, practically, of themselves. Allied with this pantheistic tendency is what is only too common in Western people also, *viz.* a desire to shift one's responsibility off oneself. Hence a Hindustani subordinate, when convicted of a fault, says "Hāñ, mujh se qusūr huā," "yes, a fault came into existence from me," rather than "maiñ ne qusūr kiyā," "I have committed a fault." Indeed, we also say "forgive all that *is past;*" of which the Hindustani is "jo kuchh ham se huā hai, use muʿāf kar." So, "I cannot do this" is more idiomatically expressed by "mujh se yih nahīñ ho saktā" than by "maiñ yih nahīñ kar saktā."

Neuter Roots coined

2. But whatever the cause may be, there can be no doubt that the Indian mind prefers, as a rule, to regard the intransitive as the original, and the transitive as derived therefrom. Indeed, so much is this the case, that Hindustanis have in many cases *coined* a *root* to express the neuter, intransitive aspect of a transitive verb already existing;

which thus *appears* as a causal derived therefrom, though really the apparent causal was the original. *E.gr.* "silnā," "to be sewn," derived from the causal "silānā," "to cause to sew;" "dhulnā," "to be washed," from "dhulānā," "to cause to wash," the causal of "dhonā," "to wash;" "pukarnā," "to be called out," formed from "pukārnā," "to call out;" "dīkhnā," "to be seen," "to appear," formed from "dekhnā," "to see;" "palnā," "to be educated," formed from "pālnā," "to educate."

Neuter rather than Passive

3. Hence it comes to pass, that very often what we express by a passive is expressed in Hindustani by a neuter verb. *E.gr.* we should say to a carpenter, "when will this table *be made?*" but no Hindustani would say "yih mez kab banāī jāegī?", but "yih mez kab banegī?" lit. "when will this table come into a made state?" So, we should say "these words have *been blotted* out," but the Hindustani is "yih alfāz miṭ gaye haiñ," not "miṭāye gaye haiñ." See more of this in the next chapter.

Secondary Causals

4. Another consequence of the same principle is, that when one wants to say that an action, which is expressed by a causal formed from an intransitive root, is done *through another* person, a *secondary causal* (*i.e.* a causal of a causal) has to be formed. *E.gr.* "bannā" means "to come into a made state;" "banānā" means "to bring into such a state," *i.e.* "to make;" and "banwānā" to get some one else to make." Evidently, however, when the root is transitive, there is no need of a secondary causal; and therefore, though common, it should be avoided. *E.gr.* "kar," "do," is a transitive root; therefore, to express "to get

some one else to do," "karānā" is quite sufficient. "Karwānā," which many people say, cannot express anything different from "karānā," and therefore should be avoided.

Causals make for clearness

5. The almost unlimited power of forming causals, which Hindustani possesses, is very convenient, because on many occasions it enables one to be more accurate, and to make one's meaning more clear, than would be otherwise possible. *E.gr.* we say "Solomon built the temple in Jerusalem," though we know that he did not build it with his own hands, but through others. But no Hindustani would say "Sulaimān ne Yarūshalem kā mandir banāyā," but "banwāyā." Again, we say "Saul offered sacrifices," though we know that only the priests could actually offer them, and a king could only get *them* to offer. Therefore, to say in Hindi "Shāūl ne balidān charhāye" would imply that Saul broke that law; but "Shāūl ne balidān charhwāye" implies that he kept it. However, this distinction is not absolutely observed, even in Hindustani; where there is no fear of misunderstanding, Hindustanis also act on the principle that "what one does by another one does by oneself." Yet a foreigner, at least until he has a good grip of the language, is safer to observe it than to neglect it.

Bulānā and Kahlānā

6. There are two causal verbs, whose causality is not generally noticed by foreigners. One of them is "bulānā," "to call," *i.e.* to cause to come to oneself. This is the causal of "bolnā," "to speak;" and properly means to cause a person to say Yes, or Here I am, or something else to show that he hears and attends. If foreigners understood this, they would not give such ridiculous orders as "gāṛī

bulāo," for "call for the carriage." The other verb is "kahlānā," "to be called," *i.e.* "to be named" so and so. This properly means "to cause some one to say" so and so. *E.gr.* "wuh Paṇḍit kahlātā hai," "he is called a Pandit," properly means "he is the cause of other people saying 'Pandit'." If this had been everywhere understood, we should not meet, in some translations, with the impossible form "kahlāyā jānā."

Use of Se

7. Neuter and causal verbs both take "se;" the former, with the person or thing *from* which the state, or change of state, springs; the latter, with the person who is caused to bring about the state, or change of state. *E.gr.* "yih mujh se nahīñ bantā," or "nahīñ ho saktā," "I cannot do this," properly means "this does not come into a made state," or "this cannot come to be," "from me." The rule, that causal verbs take "se" with the person through whom an action is done, is so absolute, that it over-rides other rules about "se," where the proximity of two "se"s would be bad. *E.gr.* "ʿAbdullāh ke pās ʿAlībakhsh se kahlā bhejo," "send word to Abdullah by Alibakhsh." Here, if "ʿAlībakhsh se" did not intervene, "send to Abdullāh" would be "ʿAbdullāh *se* kahlā bhejo;" but if this construction were kept in this sentence, it would be doubtful, of Abdullāh and Alibakhsh, which was the one to whom word should be sent, and which was the messenger; therefore one of them must be changed; and the one changed is *not* the "se" which belongs to the causal.

Reflexive Verbs

8. Reflexive verbs are abhorrent to the genius of Hindustani. Sometimes, it is true, they cannot be avoided; *e.gr.* in the temptation "cast thyself down" from the pinnacle of the temple, "gir jā"

would not sufficiently convey the voluntariness of the suggested act, and therefore "apne āp ko girā de" is necessary. But, except in such cases, the place of reflexive verbs is taken by *neuter* verbs. *E.gr.* "when I bow myself in the house of Rimmon" is not (in good Hindustani) "jab maiñ Rimmon ke mandir meñ apne āp ko jhukaūñ," but simply "jab.....jhukūñ." (In the current Urdu version of the second commandment, the translator had not even the poor excuse of following the English, when he rendered "thou shalt not bow down to them" by "tū unke āge apne taiñ mat jhukā," instead of "un ke āge na jhuknā").

Formation of Causals

9. Primary causals are formed in two ways from roots. Many verbs form them by lengthening the vowel of the root, *e.gr.* from "bañṭnā," "to be distributed," comes "bāñṭnā," "to distribute." But when the vowel is *i*, it is (as a rule) lengthened, not to *ī*, but to *e*, *e.gr.* from "phirnā," "to turn," *viz.* oneself, comes "phernā," "to turn" something else. And when the vowel is *u*, it is lengthened not to *ū*, but to *o*, *e.gr.* from "khulnā," "to be opened," comes "kholnā," "to open." But the great majority of verbs form their causals by inserting *ā* between the root and the termination, *e.gr.* from "girnā," "to fall" comes "girānā," "to throw down;" from "uṭhnā," "to rise," comes "uṭhānā," "to take up" or "lift up;" from "chalnā," "to move," comes "chalānā," "to cause to move." If the root vowel is long, it becomes short when this *ā* is added; *e.gr.* from "bhāgnā," "to flee," comes "bhagānā," "to cause to flee," "to drive away;" from "bhūlnā," "to err," comes "bhulānā," "to cause to err." In some verbs, *both* modes of forming the causal are in use; *e.gr.* "meṭnā" aur "miṭānā" are equally good causals of "miṭnā," "to be blotted out."

In some few of these verbs, the two causals have different meanings; *e.gr.* from "phirnā," "to turn," come "phernā" in the sense of turning some person or thing *right-about-face*, or causing him or it to *return*; and also "phirānā" in the sense of causing a person or thing to turn *round*, as a horse when it is being broken in.

10. Many verbs insert a *l* before the *ā* of the causal; and these are of *two kinds*. Verbs whose root ends in a vowel *must* insert the *l*; *e.gr.* "jīnā," "to live," "jilānā," "to quicken;" "pīnā," "to drink," "pilānā," "to give to drink;" "khānā," "to eat," "khilānā," "to give to eat;" "sonā," "to sleep," "sulānā," "to put to sleep." Besides these, many verbs *optionally* insert the *l*: *e.gr.* "batānā" and "batlānā," "to tell;" "baiṭhānā aur "biṭhlānā," "to give a seat to" any one. But in all the latter cases the *l* is unnecessary, and therefore it is condemned by the best authorities on the language.

Insertion of L

11. There are a few verbs which admit no causal, *viz.* "ānā," "jānā," "rahnā," "honā," "paṛnā," "jānnā." *Practically*, "to cause to come" is "to bring," "le ānā;" "to cause to go" is either "le jānā," "to take away" or "pahunchānā," "to cause to arrive;" "to cause to remain" is "rakhnā," to "keep;" "to cause to become" or "to cause to come into being" is "karnā," "to do" or "to make." And "girānā" answers well as a causal for "paṛnā." The reason why "jānnā" has no causal is that "janānā" is the causal of "jannā," and means "to help to bring forth." "Batānā" is the *practical* causal of "jānnā."

Verbs without Causals

In some cases, the neuter and the causal forms of the past participle are used together; *e.gr.* "pakā pakāyā khānā," "food already cooked;" "sunī sunāī bāt," "mere hearsay."

CHAPTER XIV.

Passive Verbs.

1. On the whole, Hindustani is not fond of passive verbs, and generally avoids them in some way or other. Mostly, this is done by the use of the neuter form instead (as has already been mentioned), *e.gr.* "the clothes have been washed," when no emphasis is intended on the person by whom they have been washed, is in Hindustani "kapṛe dhul gaye," *not* "kapṛe dhoe gaye." So, "that your sins may be forgiven" is not "ki tumhāre gunāh muʿāf kiye jāeñ," but rather "muʿāf hoñ." The reason for this is doubtless the one given above, that Hindustanis do not think, as we do, in terms of personality; and the passive voice *implies* a voluntary agent, whether the latter be expressed or not. Yet often the passive is exchanged for the *active*, which expresses personality; *e.gr.* "because the ark of God was taken" is idiomatically rendered by "Parameshwar ke sandūk ke *le lene* ke kāran," rather than "le liye jāne ke kāran." Again "Jesus was led up by the Spirit" is, in good Urdu, *not* "Yeshūʿ Rūh se pahunchāyā gayā," but "Rūh Yeshūʿ ko *le gaī*;" "she, being instructed by her mother, said" is "wuh apnī mā ke *sikhāne* se bolī," not "se sikhāe jāne se." And the common phrase "it is said," in French "on dit," is in Hindustani "kahte haiñ," "they say."

Substitutes for the Passive

2. On the other hand, in certain connexions

Use of the Passive

Hindustani even prefers the passive form. If we wish to say of a certain opinion, that it "is found" in a certain book, we must *not* use the neuter verb "milnā" (see Chapter XVI, section 2), but translate literally, "pāyā jātā hai." And "we shall see," said of a future event surmised, but not ascertained, is "dekhā jāegā," "it will be seen." This is specially the case in *negative* sentences, where the passive includes the notion of *impossibility*, along with that of mere passivity; *e.gr.* "yih mujh se khāyā nahīñ jātā," "I cannot eat this;" "aisā dukh sahā nahīñ jātā," "such pain is intolerable." And, strangely enough, this form of speech is used even with intransitive verbs, which properly speaking do not admit a passive; *e.gr.* "mujh se uṭhā nahīñ jātā," "I cannot get up;" "mujh se rahā nahīñ jātā," "I cannot wait." This curious form perhaps arose from a confusion between the neuter and the passive verb.

Use of Khānā

3. The meaning of the passive is often expressed by the verb "khānā," "to eat," along with an appropriate noun. *E.gr.* "mār khānā," "to be beaten;" (lit. "to eat strokes") "ṭhokar khānā," "to be tripped up;" "dhokhā khānā," "to be deceived."

English incorrect

4. In some cases, the English incorrectly uses the passive, and the Hindustani correctly uses the neuter. *E.gr.* we speak of a person "being killed" by falling down a precipice, though there is no murderous agent present to our minds; but Hindustanis, in all such cases, correctly say "marnā."

5. The postposition used with the passive, as with the neuter and causal, to denote the agent, is *se;* as in

the example above, "yih mujh se khāyā nahīñ jātā;" also "kyā yih āp hī se likhā gayā?" "was this written by *you?*" Sometimes, however, it is better, for the sake of clearness (seeing that "se" is used in a great variety of senses), to add "kī taraf" or "kī or" before "se;" *e.gr.* "wuh nabī Khudā kī taraf se bhejā gayā" is better than "Khudā se bhejā gayā" for "that prophet was sent by God;" "wuh Rājā kī or se ṭhahrāyā gayā thā," "he had been appointed by the King." Perhaps, however, in all such cases, in the minds of Hindustanis, the idea expressed by "from" is combined with that of the agent.

Postposition Accompanying

6. The old sign of the passive voice was the addition of "iya" or "iye" to the root. This termination has survived in two tenses, the present and the imperative. In the former it has survived in only two verbs, *viz.* "chāhnā" and "jānnā." "Chāhiye" means, properly, "is desired." And it is constantly used in this sense. "Tum ko kyā chāhiye?", "what do you want?", is literally "what is desired by you?" (only, the original passive meaning being forgotten, "ko" has taken the place of "se"). Hence arises a secondary meaning, *viz.* "is desirable;" and from this comes the partly or wholly moral meaning of "is proper," "is right." Indeed, there is no word in Hindustani which so well expresses the sense of "duty" as "chāhiye:" and yet the foreigner must always remember that it is *also* used in a far *weaker* sense. For the imperative ending "iye," see Chap. XV, section 9.

The termination "Iye"

7. The form "jāniye" occurs only in the phrase "kyā jāniye?" which literally means "what is known?",

but is used *either* in the sense of "I don't know,' *or* (more commonly) in that of "perhaps." But in both these senses "kyā jāne?" is much more common now; which is literally "what should one know?"

Jāniye

CHAPTER XV.

Tenses of Verbs.

Section I.—General Remarks.

1. In this chapter we use the word tense" incorrectly, for want of any other word to express the meaning. And the incorrectness is in two directions. On the one hand, "tense" properly refers to *time;* but what we here call tenses have only in some cases any connotation of time. On the other, we use the word so as to include "mood." The fact is, we want a word to express those verbal forms which differ among themselvss *only* in number, person, and gender, but not otherwise in meaning. (Three of them, the infinitive, the present participle, and the conjunctive participle, have not even all these differences—the infinitive distinguishes genders, but not numbers or persons; the conjunctive participle makes *no* distinction; the present participle distinguishes number and

General Remarks

gender, but not person—but they are included among "tenses," because the different forms which each of them assumes have all the same meaning, which is different from that of the other "tenses"). The old Sanskrit grammarians coined a word for this, *viz.* "lakār," lit. "the letter l;" because they called each of these aggregations of verbal forms by a word beginning with *l*, which they coined for it; *e.gr.* "lit," "lang," "ling," etc. But English grammar contains no corresponding word; therefore we are fain to fall back on "tense."

2. To name these "tenses," foreign grammarians of Hindustani have coined long and strange combinations of words, which are apt to puzzle and dishearten the beginner. Therefore we will, as far as possible, use only those terms which are already well known to most English speakers in connexion with their own mother-tongue.

3. Leaving aside for the present the infinitive Form 2, the superlative Form 3, and conjunctive participle, which show no distinction of person or number, the remaining tenses may be divided into two classes; *viz.* those which affix the terminations, which indicate person, number, and gender, *directly* to the root; and those which insert a *t* between the root and the terminations. The *t* is certainly derived from the termination of the present participle in Sanskrit; and the tenses without a *t* are probably derived from the Sanskrit past participle. Those *with* the *t* are (1) the present, (2) the imperfect, (3) the conditional, (4) the present participle. Those *without* it are (1) the simple past, (2) the perfect, (3) the pluperfect, (4) the imperative Form 1, (5) the imperative Form 2, (6) the subjunctive, (7) the future, (8) the past participle.

Classification

Section 2.—The Present Participle.

1. This is declined just like an adjective ending in *ā; i.e.* the unmodified singular masculine ends in *ā;* the modified singular masculine, and the plural masculine, end in *e;* and the feminine of both numbers ends in *ī.* Four things are to be noted in the use of this participle.

Present Participle

2. Where there is any danger of its being mistaken for the present tense (see below), and often where there is no such *apparent* danger, the past participle of the verb "honā" is added to it, in the same form (*i.e.* number, gender, and whether modified or unmodified). *E.gr.* "wuh kāmptā huā āyā," "he came trembling;" "sipāhī chillāte hue lapke," "the soldiers rushed forward shouting;" "ʿauratеñ rotī huī chalī gaīñ," "the women went away crying."

"Huā" added

3. With the object of a verb expressed by "ko," the present participle may end in either *ā* or *e*, but the latter is more usual. *E.gr.* "maiñ ne us ko kūdte phāndte dekhā," "I saw him leaping and jumping," but "kūdtā phāndtā" would not be wrong. So, "us ne unheñ sote pāyā," "he found them sleeping," is more usual than "us ne unheñ *sotā* pāyā."

Modified or unmodified

4. The modified masculine form of the present participle is often followed by "meñ," "se," or a noun. *E.gr.* "Pahāṛ se utarte meñ Yeshūʿ ne unheñ hukm diyā," "As they were coming down from the mountain, Jesus com-

With Postpositions

manded them" (compare with this construction the French "en passant"); "Pah phaṭte waqt Maryam āī," "when dawn was breaking, Mary came."

Insertion of "Ke"

5. When the participle refers *not* to the subject of the sentence, but to something else, *ke* is often inserted (or, in the case of personal pronouns, the genitive is used). *E.gr.* "un ke dekhte dekhte wuh ūpar uṭhā liyā gayā," "as they were looking, He was taken up," "Yākūb ko chalte chalte sūraj ugā," "the sun rose to Jacob as he was going;" "hamāre yahāñ rahte hue us ne yih fasād uṭhāyā," "he stirred up this commotion while we were living here." Clauses of this kind are commonly called in European languages, specially in Latin and Greek, "*absolute* clauses;" *e.gr.* "me presente," "I being present." In the vernacular of the East of Hindustan, there is an interesting relic of this absolute present participle of the substantive verb, *viz.* "āchhat;" *e.gr.* "Dasharatha āchhat Rāma vanavās ko gayā," "Rām went to live in the forest while Dasharath was (alive)."

6. There are some curious uses of the present participle followed by a verb, where one would expect the conjunctive participle; *e.gr.* "jātā rahnā," "to go right away," specially used for "to die;" "lete āo," "bring it along;" where one would rather expect "jākar rahnā," "lekar āo," or "le āo."

Section 3.—The Present and Imperfect.

1. The present is formed of the present participle (in the appropriate number and gender), together with the present tense of the substantive verb (called in

English "to be") to form the present, and with its imperfect tense to form the imperfect. Thus, *e.gr.* "maiñ likhtā hūñ" means, literally, "I am writing," "striyāñ hañstī thīñ," "the women were laughing." This is what may be called the "*actual* present and imperfect," which indicate either that the action referred to is happening at the same moment that the speaker is speaking about it, or that it was happening at a certainpast time, defined in the context. But the Hindustani present is used *also* for the *habitual* present and imperfect, which express either that an action is in the habit of happening, or that it was in such a habit in a defined past time; *e.gr.* "maiñ likhtā hūñ" means "I am in the habit of writing" as well as "I am now writing;" and "striyāñ hañstī thīñ" means "the women were in the habit of laughing" as much as that they were laughing at a certain moment. Indeed, where there is nothing in the context to decide which of these meanings the Hindustani present and imperfect bear, it is generally safe to assume that they have the *habitual* meaning. In older English, as in Hindustani, these two meanings were expressed by the same form; *e.gr.* "he goes to war" meant equally "he is going to war at this particular time," and "he is in the habit of going to war." But in modern English, "he goes" commonly means "he is in the habit of going;" for the other meaning we would rather say "he is going."

Present and Imperfect

Actual and Habitual

2. When it is important to distinguish these two meanings, Hindustani has another device for the purpose. If the "actual" present or imperfect is intended, the past participle of "rahnā" is added to the root of the

Actual

verb, and is followed by the present or imperfect of the substantive verb, in the appropriate form. Thus, for "I am writing," while "maiñ likhtā hūñ" will express it, yet it is ambiguous unless something in the context shows clearly that *this* is the meaning; and therefore "maiñ likh rahā hūñ" is better, because liable to no ambiguity. Similarly, "I was writing" is better, as a rule, expressed by "maiñ likh rahā thā" than by "maiñ likhtā thā."

3. On the other hand, if the "habitual" present or imperfect be intended, then *ā* is added to the root (see section 12 of this chapter), and the verb "karnā" is appended in the appropriate form of the present or imperfect, as may be desired. Thus, "I write," in the sense of "I am in the habit of writing" (as when we say "I write an essay every day"), may well be "maiñ likhtā hūñ;" but if one wants to guard against being misunderstood, one should say "maiñ likhā kartā hūñ." Similarly, "I wrote," in the sense of "I was in the habit of writing," may well be "maiñ likhtā thā," but "maiñ likhā kartā thā" is clearer.

Habitual

4. To recapitulate, using the verb "paṛhnā:" "He reads," meaning "he is reading," is "wuh paṛhtā hai" or "wuh paṛh rahā hai." "He read," meaning "he was reading," is "wuh paṛhtā thā" or "wuh paṛh rahā thā." "He reads," meaning "he is in the habit of reading," is "wuh paṛhtā hai" or "wuh paṛhā kartā hai." "He read," meaning "he was in the habit of reading," is "wuh paṛhtā thā" or "wuh paṛhā kartā thā." The latter phrase will be explained in section 12; for the former we have no explanation to offer, *i.e.* (specially) it is not clear why the *past* tense of "rahnā" should be employed to indicate a *present* meaning. One can only say, this is the idiom.

5. The so-called "historic present," *i.e.* where past events are described in the present tense, in order to present them as a picture before the mind's eye, is *not* in use in Hindustani. Very many instances of it occur in the Gospels; but in Hindustani they should *not* be translated literally, but by the simple past tense. But there are two *other* non-literal uses of the present tense in Hindustani, in one of which the English agrees with it, but in the other it does not. The former is the use of the present to denote what actually happened in the past, but still exists *in a book*. As we say "St. Paul *says*" so-and-so "in one of his Epistles," so can Hindustanis say in their own language; and this usage is not derived from English Christians, for Hindus and Muhammadans follow it in respect of the Shāstras and the Qur'ān.

Historic Present

6. The other non-literal use of the present in Hindustani is in the sense of a person being *just going* to do something. "Maiñ jātā hūñ" does *not only* mean either "I am in the act of going" or "I am in the habit of going," but also "I am just about to go." And where a public speaker, in English, says at the beginning of his discourse "I will speak of three things on this occasion," or "I will treat the subject under three heads," in Hindustani he says "Maiñ is waqt tīn bātoñ kā bayān *kartā hūñ*," or "maiñ is mazmūn ko tīn hissoñ meñ taqsīm *kartā hūñ*." So, a servant, on receiving an order to open a bottle, jar, etc., may reply "Abhī khol detā hūñ," "I am just going to open it."

Proximate Action

7. We may as well say here, what applies to all tenses in which there is a distinction of number, that whenever a person is addressed by the pronoun "āp,"

the verb, to which "āp" is the subject, must be put in the plural number of the third person; and similarly, whenever a person is spoken *of*, who, if addressed, would be addressed as "āp," the verb, of which that person is the subject, must be put in the plural number of the third person.

Construction with "Āp"

8. Where, in English, the "actual" imperfect is followed by "when," this must be rendered in Hindustani by "ki," not by "jab." *E.gr.* "I was reading the newspaper, when he came in," "Maiñ ākẖbār parh rahā thā, ki wuh andar āyā."

Construction with "ki"

9. When two or more verbs, in the present or imperfect tense, have the same subject, and are joined together by a conjunction, the "substantive verb" is not repeated, *i.e.* it is expressed *only with the last* verb. *E.gr.* "we thartharāte aur bhāgte haiñ," "they tremble and flee away;" "ham mātam karte aur yih kahte the," "we mourned, and said as follows." But the substantive verb must never be omitted at the end; except in negative sentences (see below). This rule applies also to the perfect and pluperfect, and for the same reason, *viz.* to avoid tautology where there is no fear of misunderstanding.

Omission of Substantive Verb

10. When the present (not the imperfect) is preceded by the negative "nahīñ," the substantive verb is omitted. *E.gr.* "I cannot go there" is *not* "Maiñ wahāñ nahīñ jā saktā hūñ," but only "Maiñ wahāñ

Negative

nahīñ jā saktā." The reason for this will be explained in the chapter on negative particles [see Chapter XXVIII, section 1 (1)].

Section 4—The Conditional.

Conditional

1. This is in form just like the present participle, except that the feminine plural ends, not in *ī*, but in *īñ*; *e.gr.* "wuh ʿaurateñ soī rahtīñ," "those women would have remained asleep."

Two Kinds

2. There are two kinds of conditional sentences, *viz.* those in which the condition is regarded as realisable, and those in which it is believed to be unrealisable. Let it be clearly understood that the tense which we call the "conditional" has *nothing* to do with the *former* kind of sentences, which will be discussed later; but *only* with the *latter*. And a condition may be unrealisable for two reasons; either because it refers to past time, which because it is past cannot be now realised; or because there is some insuperable cause preventing its realisation in the present or the future. But the conditional is used, in Hindustani, in *both* these kinds of sentences; and it is used in *both parts* of such sentences, the protasis and the apodosis, *i.e.* (here) the clause containing the condition, and that containing the verb which expresses what *would* take place, or *would have* taken place, had the condition been realisable. *E.gr.* "agar tum mujh se yih bāt kal kahte, to maiñ aisā na kartā," "if you had told me this yesterday, I would not have acted thus;" "yadi mere pankh hote, to maiñ abhī Wilāyat ko uṛ jātā," "if I had wings, I would at this instant fly to Europe." In

the first of these examples, the meaning may also be expressed by the past participle, and the conditional of the verb "honā;" thus, "agar tum *ne* mujh se yih bāt kal *kahī* hotī," etc.

3. When the verb in the apodosis is "honā," the imperfect of the substantive verb *may* take the place of the conditional of "honā;" *e.gr.* "agar zulm kī bāt hotī, to wājib *thā* ki maiñ tumhārī bardāsht karūñ," "if it were a matter of assault" (which it is *not*), "it would be reasonable that I should bear with you."

Substitution of "Thā"

4. Some sentences imply a condition, though not expressed in a conditional form; and in such cases the conditional tense is used. *E.gr.* in "It was not possible that He should remain in its grasp" really implies "If it had been possible, He would have remained in its grasp;" and therefore the Urdu is "mumkin na thā ki wuh us ke qabze meñ *rahtā*," not "rahe." So, "tujhe lāzim thā ki merā rupaiyā sāhūkāroñ ko detā, to maiñ ākar apnā māl sūd samet le letā," "thou oughtest to have given my money to the bankers, then I should have received my property with interest;" where the implied meaning is, "*if* thou *hadst* given," etc., "*then* I would have received," etc.

Condition Implied

Section 5.—The Past Participle.

1. This is formed by adding to the root of the verb *ā* in the unmodified masculine singular, *e* in the modified masculine singular and in the masculine plural, and *ī* in the feminine in both

Past Participle

numbers. There are very few irregularities in the formation of this participle; that of "honā" is "huā," that of "karnā" is "kiyā," those of "denā" and "lenā" are "diyā" and "liyā," and that of "jānā" is "gayā." What has been said, in section 2 of this chapter, of the present participle applies equally to this participle; *e.gr.* "merī kahī huī bāteñ," "the things which I have said."

2. Like the present participle (see section 2, 4 of this chapter), the past participle is often used "absolutely," *i.e.* referring to some person or thing *not* the subject of the sentence. *E.gr.* "chār baje āūngā." "I will come at 4 o'clock" (lit. "four having struck, I will come"); "āp ko yahāñ āe hue kitne din hue?" "How long is it since you came here?" (lit. "to you, having come here, how many days have elapsed?") "Karma kā likhā kisī ke meṭe nahīñ miṭṭā," "what is written by fate is not erased by any one's erasing," *i.e.* "trying to erase it." And, similarly, "māre" (lit. "struck") is used (with "ke") practically as a noun meaning "cause;" *e.gr.* "wuh bhūkh ke māre bahut dukhit hai," "he is very distressed by reason of hunger," lit. "by hunger *striking* (him)." Verbs in the past participle are also attached to other verbs in a way which it is difficult to explain; *e.gr.* "Apnī najāt kā kām kiye jāo," "work out your own salvation" (lit. "go on, with the work of your salvation done"); "maiñ kahe detā hūñ," "I positively affirm;" "wuh chalā gayā," "he went away;" "chale āo," "come along;" "we daure āe," "they came running;" "hamārī mash'aleñ bujhī jātī haiñ," "our torches *are going out*." For a special use of the past participle, see section 13, 11 of this chapter.

Used absolutely

Section 6.—The Simple Past.

Simple Past

1. The *simple past* tense (which corresponds in meaning with the English "went," "did," "said," etc.,) stands in the same relation to the past participle, that the conditional stands in to the present participle; *i.e.* it is identical with it in form, except that the plural feminine ends in *īñ*, not in *ī*. Besides what has been mentioned above, *viz.* that the substantive verb is omitted in the case of all but the last of a series of perfect tenses which are connected by "aur," and have the same subject, it is also to be noted that it is very often omitted where no such reason for omission exists, but where there is no room for ambiguity; *e.gr.* "Maiñ ā gayā," for "I am arrived," is better than "maiñ ā gayā huñ," because shorter; though the latter is not wrong. So, "wuh to abhī chalā gayā," "why, he is just gone away;" where the full form would add "hai" at the end; but it is not necessary in such a sentence.

Construction with Ne

2. The *construction* of this tense differs according to whether the verb is transitive or intransitive. In the latter case, it agrees with its *subject* in gender and number; *e.gr.* "ustād āya," "the (male) teacher came," "ustānī āī," "the (female) teacher came," "tīn ādmī āye," "three men came;" "tīn ʿaurateñ āīñ," "three women came." But in the former case, it agrees with its *object, unless* that object is protected from its influence by the postposition "ko"; in which case the simple past is put in the singular, unmodified masculine, form; and in any case the subject of the verb must have the postposition "ne" attached to it. *E.gr.* maiñ ne ek ghoṛā kharīdā," "I bought a horse;" "maiñ ne do ghoṛe kharīde," "I bought two horses;" "maiñ ne ek ghoṛī kharīdī,"

"I have bought a mare"; "maiñ ne do ghoṛiyāñ kharīdīñ," "I have bought two mares." But in "I have bought *that* horse," or "mare," or "*those* horses," or "mares," *i.e.* where "ko" is added to the object, and (*e.gr.*) "us" precedes the object, the form "kharīdā" is preserved throughout, with every change of number and gender in the object. Literally, "maiñ ne ek ghoṛā kharīdā" means "by me a horse [was] bought;" and "maiñ ne us ghoṛe ko kharīdā" means "by me bought [a buying was transacted] to that horse."

3. There is a curious idiomatic use of the simple past, where the meaning is that of a future perfect. "If God will" is often expressed by "agar Khudā ne chāhā," lit. "if God *willed*," *i.e.* "if God shall have willed" at the future time spoken of.

Future sense

4. We say of a road, that it "*goes*" to such a place. In Hindustani the present is not wrong in such cases; but a more idiomatic use is that of the *simple past; e.gr.* "yih rastā kahāñ gayā?", "where does this road go?" The fact is that, while we think only of the road as existing at present, Hindustanis preferably think of the time *when it was made.*

Section 7.—The Perfect and Pluperfect.

5. These are formed by adding the present and imperfect, respectively, of the substantive verb to the simple past; *e.gr.* "wuh gayā," "he went;" "wuh gayā hai," "he is, or has, gone;" "us ne mujhe mārā," "he struck me;" "us ne mujhe mārā thā," "he had struck me."

Perfect and Pluperfect

2. Learners must beware of thinking that the use of these tenses in Hindustani exactly, or even very nearly, corresponds with that of the corresponding tenses in English. For instance, we use the perfect of an event which is quite past, and even its effects have passed away; *e.gr.* "I have been ill, but now am well." But in Hindustani the perfect denotes an act or event which still exists, at least in its effects, at the time of speaking. Hence the above sentence must be rendered "Maiñ bīmār to thā" (or "huā to thā"), par ab achchhā hūñ," lit. "I *was*" (or "had become") "indeed ill, but now am well." So "this has been a great city," said of ruins, *e.gr.* of Babylon, by some one looking at them, will not be "yih baṛā shahr huā hai," but "yih baṛā shahr thā." Again "Have you ever gone to Kashmīr?" said to some one not now in Kashmīr, will be not "Āp kabhī Kashmīr gaye haiñ?" but "Āp kabhī Kashmīr gaye the?" (see below, in this section). Yet in the *West* of Hindustan the verb "rahnā" *is* put in the perfect in such cases; *e.gr.* "Unhoñ ne unheñ pahchānā, ki yih Yeshū' ke sāth rahe haiñ," "they recognized them, [thinking] these have been staying with Jesus;" but in the East this would have to be "rahe," or "rahe the."

Use differs from English

3. A similar difference between East and West is found in cases where the English perfect denotes a past action which *is* continued to the time of speaking. *E.gr.* "ever since I came here, I have been ill" would in the West be "jab se maiñ yahāñ āyā, bīmār *rahā hūñ*," but in the East it would be "jab se maiñ yahāñ āyā, tab se bīmār hūñ," literally "*I am* ill." So "how many days have you been doing this?" is "tum kitne din se yih kām karte ho," lit. "*are* you doing?"

East and West

4. When stress is meant to be laid on the continuity of a series of similar acts down to the present, the verb "ānā," or "chalā ānā," is inserted in its appropriate form. *E.gr.* "Mūsā kī tauret kī manādī karnewāle hote chale āe haiñ," "the law of Moses has been continuously preached," lit. "there have continuously been preachers of the law of Moses." "Saikaṛoñ baras se maiñ tumhāre pās nabī bhejtā āyā hūñ," "I have been sending prophets to you continuously for the last hundreds of years." When the speaker wishes to lay stress on the fact, that the series has lasted to the very moment of speaking, the present tense may be used instead of the perfect; as in the above example, "ātā hūñ" rather than "āyā hūñ."

Continuity in past

5. The pluperfect, too, besides denoting (as in English) an act or event which took place before another act or event just spoken of, has other uses which the English pluperfect does not share. For one thing, it is used in speaking of an event *long past*, without any reference to another event before or after it. *E.gr.* "Baṛī muddat huī, ki Angrez log Jarmanī se āe the," "very long ago the English came from Germany." "Paulus Masīhī Damishq meñ ho gayā thā," "Paul became a Christian in Damascus." This usage may be partly due to the fact mentioned in the last section, that the simple past is often used in the sense of the perfect, and to the consequent feeling that if the simple past was used in sentences like the above, the meaning of the perfect tense might be read into them. At any rate, this usage is *not* observed in a *narrative* of past events, where one past tense succeeds another; in such cases the simple past is used.

Special use of Pluperfect

6. The pluperfect occurs in Hindustani, also when it is important to show that the action does not extend to the present time; *e.gr.* "Hāñ, ek chek mere pās āyā to thā, par maiñ ne use wāpas kar diyā," "Yes, I received a cheque, but returned it;" "tumhārā rupaiyā mujhe mil gayā thā," "I received your money" (said by Joseph's steward to his brethren, when he had restored the money into their sacks); ("mil gayā" without "thā" would naturally be taken in the sense of "mil gayā hai," "I *have* received it," which would not have been true); "Yeshū' jo maslūb huā thā," "Jesus who was crucified" (the omission of "thā" would at least cast doubt on the fact that He had risen again); "wuh mere ghar par āyā thā," "he came to my house" (the omission of "thā" would suggest that he was still in my house). But there is a foolish way that some Indians have, arising from an unreal modesty, of saying "maiñ āp ke pās is liye āyā thā, ki....," when they are *not* referring to a *former* visit, as their words imply, but to the *present* one so that they ought to say "maiñ āp ke pās is liye āyā hūñ, ki....."

Extends not to present

7. On the other hand, we use the pluperfect of the former of two or more successive acts, where the Hindustani employs the simple past. *E.gr.* "when they had come to him, he said" is not "jab wuh us ke pās āe the," but simply "āe," "us ne kahā." So "when three years had gone by, he went forth to war" is not "jab tīn baras bīt gaye the," but simply "bīt gaye," "tab wuh larne ko niklā." The reason of this is that Hindustanis, in such cases, do not *think* of the one event as preceding the other, but simply as an event in the same series as the other.

Not in succession of Acts

Section 8—Subjunctive and Future.

1. The subjunctive is called by many grammarians the "aorist;" though it is difficult to see any reason for this, seeing that it bears no resemblance in meaning to the Greek tense so called. It is formed by affixing to the root of the verb "ūñ" for the first person singular, "e" for the second and third persons singular, "eñ" for the first and third persons plural, and "o" for the second person plural. There is no distinction of gender in this tense. The future is formed by adding to the subjunctive, in each person and number, "gā" for the masculine, and "gī" for the feminine, of all three persons in the singular, and "ge" for the masculine, and "gī" (not "gīñ") for the feminine, of all three persons in the plural. These terminations of the future are relics of an old verb meaning "to go;" * hence, *e.gr.* "maiñ likhūngā" means literally "I am *going* to write." Indeed, the sense of this meaning of the future terminations has not yet been wholly lost; and this is why, alone of all verbal terminations, the particle "hī" may be inserted before them, *i.e.* between the subjunctive terminations and them; *e.gr.* "Yahowā yih karehīgā," "Jehovah will indeed do this;" "dusht apnī dushtatā kā phal bhogeñhīge," "the wicked will certainly reap the reward of their wickedness."

Subjunctive and Future

2. The subjunctive had not always a subjunctive sense; in old Hindi it was employed, and in Eastern Hindi and Bengali it is still employed, in the sense of the "habitual present;" so that,

Old Meaning of Subjunctive

Viz. the Sanskrit verb from which the form "gayā" is derived, and which is akin to our "go."

e.gr. "karị" meant "I am," or "we are, in the habit of doing," and "kare" meant "he" or "she is in the habit of doing," like the literarary Hindustani "maiñ kiyā kartā hūñ" and "wuh kiyā kartā," or "kartī hai." But in literary and polite Hindustani it never occurs in this sense, but always of an event or action *dependent* on another. Besides this general statement, we can particularize only some of its uses.

Purpose

(*a*) It is the tense to use after particles signifying *purpose*, like "ki," "tāki," "jis se." *E.gr.* "Maiñ is liye āyā ki wuh zindagī pāeñ," "I came in order that they might have life;" "Mujhe sambhāl, jis se maiñ jitā rahūñ," "uphold me, so that I may live on." Here it should be observed that, whereas we use "may" and "might" respectively when (as in the above examples) the verb, on which the subjunctive depends, is in the past, or in the present or future, tense, this distinction does not affect Hindustani. In the first of the above examples the principal verb, "āyā," is in the past tense; in the second, "sambhāl" refers to the present, and its purpose to the future; yet in both cases equally Hindustani employs the subjunctive.

Protasis and Apodosis

(*b*) In sentences which have a protasis and an apodosis—*e.gr.* clauses beginning with "if" and "then," or "when" and "then"—, Western Hindustani insists on both containing the same tense, whether subjunctive or future. *E.gr.* "If you come to me to-morrow, I will tell you something" will be "Agar āp kal mere pās āeñge, to maiñ āp ko kuchh batāūñgā;" "jab tum apnā sabaq parhoge, maiñ tum ko inʿām dūngā," "when you learn your lesson, I will give you a prize." In these sentences the latter verb *must* be in the future, and therefore the former is put in the future too. But in the East this rule is not observed. There, in a clause with "if" always, and in

one with "when" often, the verb is put in the subjunctive, *though* the other verb is in the future.

(*c*) When the dependent clause expresses something indeterminate, or something which may or may not occur, its verb must be put in the subjunctive. *E.gr.* in the sentence "un bheṛoñ kī mānind jin kā charwāhā na ho," "like sheep which have no shepherd," the allusion is not to some particular sheep, but to *any* sheep which may come under the description of having no shepherd. The English ignores this distinction, and uses the present tense ("have"); but the Hindustani expresses it clearly. Another example is "Un logoñ se laṛnā, jo tum se laṛeñ," "Fight with those people who fight with you." Here "laṛte haiñ" would imply that some particular people were referred to, who were actually fighting; therefore, as the precept is a general one, applicable to all similar conditions, the subjective is necessary.

Indeterminate

(*d*) "Wish" and "intention" require the subjunctive, but "hope" requires the future. *E.gr.* "merī ichchhā hai ki tum yah kām karo," "I wish you to do this work;" "merā irāda hai ki kal shahr ko jāūñ," "I intend to go to the city to-morrow;" but "mujhe ummed hai ki kal pānī paṛegā;" "I hope it will rain to-morrow." The necessity of using the future in speaking of hope extends even to the case where the occurrence thought of is in the *present*, in which case the hope can really only refer to the person *discovering* the fact in the future. *E.gr.* when we say "I hope your son *is* doing well," we mean "I hope you *will* be able to *tell* me that he is doing well;" and the Hindi of this is "Mujhe āshā hai ki āp ke putra kā kām bhalī bhānti chaltā," not "hai," but "*hogā*."

Wish, Intention, and Hope

(*e*) A question which is really a request for permis-

sion employs the subjunctive, *e.gr.* "maiñ āūñ?" "shall I come?" in the sense of "may I come?" So also, in perplexity, "what shall I do?", in the sense of "what can I do?", "what remains that I can do?" is "kyā kareñ?", rather than kyā kareñge?" though the latter is sometimes heard in this sense. "Kaun hameñ māñs degā?" means "we wish some one would kindly do it;" but "kaun hameñ māñs de?" would mean "whose business is it to give us flesh?"

Request and Perplexity

(*f*) The future tense of the verb "honā," when attached to the predicate of a sentence or clause, imports to it the sense of *probability;* in other words, takes away from it the certainty which would otherwise belong to it. *E.gr.* to the question "kyā wilāyatī ḍāk āj āegī?" "will the mail from Europe come to-day?" the answer might well be "Hāñ, ātī hogī," "yes, probably it is coming," or "yes, I suppose it is coming." "Us laṛāī meñ kyā Tūrq hār gaye?" "Hāñ, hār gaye honge," "were the Turks beaten in that battle?", "yes, I have no doubt they were beaten." This last sentence illustrates the fact that often we use words expressing certainty (*e.gr.* "no doubt") while yet the certainty is far from complete, being merely subjective, *i.e.* in our own minds. In all such cases the future of "honā" is used in Hindustani. *E.gr.* "āp jo nahīñ āe, is se mujhe nishchay huā thā ki āp bimār hoñge," "your not coming made me feel certain that you were ill." Here the speaker's certainty must have been far from absolute, for it arose from a fact which was well capable of other explanations; and therefore "hoñge" *must*, in Hindustani, be added. Similarly, on seeing the ground outside one's house wet, one may say "Yaqīn hai ki pānī paṛā hogā;" when only having seen or heard the rain falling would justify one's saying "Yaqīn hai ki pānī paṛā hai."

Hoga

(*g*) In English, the present is often used for a future fact, because it is present to the mind of the speakers; but in Hindustani the future must always be used in such cases. Examples of this are very frequent in the Law of Moses. *E.gr.* in Exodus 25 : 22, before the Tabernacle or any of its furniture existed, God says to Moses, "I will commune with thee.....from between the two cherubs which *are* upon the ark of the Testimony;" but the Hindi is, and must be, "Maiñ .....un karūboñ ke bīch meñ se jo sākshīpatra ke sandūk par *honge* tujh se vārtā kiyā karungā." Similarly in Exodus 29 : 23, speaking of the details of a command given for the future, mention is made of "the basket of unleavened bread which *is* before the LORD;" where the Hindi is "akhmīrī roṭī kī ṭokrī jo Yahowāh ke āge dharī *hogī*." So, we say "the day after to-morrow *is* Sunday;" but in Hindustani we cannot say "Parsoñ Itwār hai," but "hogā." In the Bible we read "when that which is perfect *is* come;" but in Urdu it is "jab kāmil *āegā*."

Present not used for future

(*h*) The Hindustani future is often used in the sense of a mere *wish*, without any necessary belief that one's wish will in the future be gratified. When a servant says "Maiñ ek ghanṭe ke liye apne ghar jāūngā," it is not necessary for his master or mistress to suppose that he means that he is determined to go, whether with or without leave; probably he only means "I wish to go home for an hour." It will help the foreigner to remember, in such a case, that "will" did not originally, in English, signify the future, but simply "wish;" as to this day, in German, "ich will" means only "I wish," not the future tense.

Only wish

Section 9.—The Imperative, Form I.

1. This is exactly the same as the subjunctive, with the single exception of the second person singular, which is identical with the root of the verb, *i.e.* it has no termination. As was explained in Chap. X : 12, this second person singular is used in addressing God on the one hand, an animal on the other, and a little child by way of endearment ; and the second person plural is used in addressing all inferiors, *i.e.* those who are distinctly in a *subordinate relation* to oneself, such as servants and pupils. (*E.gr.* as long as an Indian Christian remains a foreign missionary's pupil, he should address him in the second person plural ; but as soon as he obtains an independent position as teacher or preacher, he should address him in the third person plural. But these distinctions depend, to some extent, on personal feelings ; *e.gr.* most Indian ministers feel that they ought to show their respect for their congregations by addressing them, in preaching, in the third person ; but others feel that they are speaking in God's name and with His authority, and therefore address them in the second person.)

Imperative Form I

2. It should also be noted that the second person of this first form of the imperative implies a command that a thing be done *here and now.* Of course there are verbs, such as "rahnā," which do not admit this meaning ; but even the command "raho" implies that the person commanded must *begin* to stay at once. And the "habitual" form (see above, section 3, 3) must also be excepted ; "aisā hī kiyā karo," "act in this way," necessarily implies that the action is to be repeated, and therefore cannot be finished at this moment. But even so the course of action must *begin*

Here and Now

in the present time. On the other hand, "yih karo" means that it is to be done at once; and "yih na karo" implies either that it is now being done, or that there is, now, a danger of its being done.

Section 10.—The Imperative, Form II.

1. In addressing a superior or an equal, Form I of the imperative is not used, but the form which consists of the root with "iye" affixed to it. There are a few verbs which affix this irregularly: "karnā" makes "kariye" indeed, but "kījiye" is considered much more correct; denā" makes "dījiye," "lenā" "lījiye," and "honā" "hūjiye."

Imperative, Form II

2. This form of the imperative was originally the *passive* imperative (see above, Chap. XIV, section 6). In later Sanskrit it became customary, in addressing a person with special politeness and deference, to use the passive imperative instead of the active. It was felt that an *indirect* expression of a wish was more polished than a direct one. Thus people came to say "Let this be done by you" instead of "do this;" and this was extended even to intransitive verbs, *e.gr.* "let it be stood by you" instead of "please stand." In process of time the "by you" was dropped, the passive being understood to refer to the person addressed. And in this way came the Hindustani imperative in "iye."

Origin

3. Like Form I of the imperative, this form also—with similar exceptions to those noted in the last section—can be used only when the wish or command is intended to be fulfilled

Here and Now

at once. When the idea is that it be fulfilled at some specified future time, a rather ugly extension of Form II is used, *viz.* the addition of "gā" to "iye;" *e.gr.* "jab yih chiṭṭhī āp ko milegī, to merā salām apne bhāī se kahiyegā," "when you receive this letter, be so good as to give my greetings to your brother." This form is the same in both genders and numbers.

Section 11—The Imperative, Form III.

Imperative, Form III

1. This is produced by adding "nā" to the root. Because "nā" is also the sign of the Infinitive, it is generally said that this *is* the Infinitive, only used in an imperative sense. But this is a mistake. There are in Sanskrit three forms of what in Latin is called the "gerund," and ends in "ndus," and signifies fitness, worthiness, ability, or even simple futurity; *e.gr.* "amandus," "loveable;" "agendus," "intended to be done" (hence "agenda," "matters to be transacted"). One of these Sanskrit forms adds "anīya" to the root, *e.gr.* "darshanīya," "worth seeing" (hence the Hindi "darshanī," which means the same). This "anīya" becomes in Hindustani "nā," the initial "a" being unpronounced, and the "nīya" becoming "nā" in the masculine singular, "ne" in the masculine plural, and "nī" in the feminine of both numbers. *E.gr.* "yahāñ ek ghar banānā hai," "a house must be built here;" "aur bahut se dushman jītne bāqī haiñ," "there remain many more enemies to be conquered;" "mujhe chiṭṭhī likhnī hai," "I have to write a letter" (lit. "to me there is a letter to be written"); "use bahut sī kitābeñ parhnī thīñ," "he had to read many books."

2. *From this* use of the affix "nā" came this third form of the Imperative. Take the sentence "ek ghar banānā hai," drop off the verb "hai," and the remaining words assume an imperative force. In other words, from "a house must be built" comes the direction, addressed to somebody, "build a house." But with this slight change of meaning, the change of form according to gender and number ceased. That is, this third form of the Imperative *always* ends in "nā;" never in "ne" or "nī."

Origin

3. It is *this* form of the Imperative which must always be used (1) when the action intended belongs to some definite future time; and (2) when it belongs to a custom, *i.e.* to a kind of action to be repeated, in similar circumstances, an indefinite number of times. A little thought will show that this rule springs naturally from the derivation of the "nā;" for when we say of a thing that it "is to be done" or "has to be done," we do not usually mean that it must be done on the spot, but either at some specified future time, or else as a custom or rule. This latter usage is well exemplified in the injunctions in the Law of Moses; for these injunctions, for the most part, did not order anything to be done at the moment in which they were given, but as rules to be followed in all similar circumstances. *E.g.* in the Ten Commandments the verbs conveying the commands should all be in this third form. To say to a congregation "chorī mat karo," or "chorī na karo," suggests that the speaker thinks that the congregation is either actually, at the time, engaged in stealing, or just about to steal. It should be "chorī na karnā."

When used

4. In using this third form, one need not consider whether the person addressed is superior, equal, or inferior to oneself; it is applicable to all alike.

Section 12.—The Infinitive, Form I.

Infinitive, Form I

This comes by adding "ā" to the root. In Bengali this is the regular form of the Infinitive, *e.gr.* "dekhā," "to see." But in Hindustani it survives only in three connexions. (1) in the "habitual" present and imperfect (see section 3, 3 of this chapter). "Dekhā karnā," which is translated "to be in the habit of seeing," literally means "to do a seeing." It is usual to call this "dekhā" a past participle; but for one thing, in that case it would be impossible to account for such a phrase; and for another, "to be in the habit of going" would be "gayā karnā," and not, as it is, *jāyā* karnā." (2) with the verb "chāhnā" (see below, Chap XVI, section 10); *e.gr.* "wuh marā chāhtā hai," "he is about to die." Here again, it is easy to account for the phrase if "marā" is an infinitive, but very difficult if it be a participle. (3) In all probability, in the usual passive form. The only cause of doubt in this case is that the verb, which adds "ā" to the root before "jānā," declines that termination according to gender and number. But this might easily happen, by a false analogy (a cause of very many corruptions in language), when once the origin of the phrase was forgotten. Anyhow, it is much easier to believe that "dekhā jānā," which now means "to be seen," originally meant "to go to a seeing" than to think that "dekhā" is here a past participle. A somewhat analogous case in the Latin future passive infinitive, "amatum iri," which literally means "to be gone to loving," or "to be gone to being loved."

Section 13—The Infinitive, Form II.

Infinitive, Form II

1. This adds "nā" to the root, but differs from the third form of the Imperative by being declined in gender and number, and from the gerundial construction (*e.gr.* "mujhe chiṭṭhī likhnī hai") by being declined in *case*, as well as gender and number. It is doubtful whether the "nā" of this form of the Infinitive is derived, like form III of the Imperative, from the Sanskrit gerund affix "anīya," or from the affix "ana," which indicates an abstract noun formed from the root; *e.gr.* "gamana," "a going," from the root "gam," "to go;" "dāna," "a gift," from the root "dā," "to give;" "pālāyana," "flight," from "pālāy," "to flee;" etc. Probably both origins were unconsciously confused together in the Indian mind; but the fact that the Hindustani Infinitive is declined, like an adjective or participle, in gender and number (see above, section 11, 1) seems to point to the Sanskrit gerund as its origin; while the fact that the Infinitive is, as such, a noun, standing like every other noun as subject or object to a verb, and that it is, in Hindustani, declined in case, seems to point to the Sanskrit abstract noun in "ana" as its origin.

Idiomatic Use

2. This infinitive is used, idiomatically, in cases where we do not use the infinitive. *E.gr.* we might say to a stranger, on meeting him the first time in a place, "āp yahāñ kab āe?" but an Indian would more naturally say, "āp kā yahāñ ānā kab huā?" lit. "when did your coming here take place?" So, "kyā āp kā Kāshī jānā kabhī huā?" for "Have you ever been to Kāshī?"; "ab tumhārā yahāñ rahnā zarūr nahīñ," "now you need not stay here."

3. Where this infiinitive, modified because of a postposition following, is preceded by a noun or pronoun denoting the object of the infinitive, it is more idiomatic to connect the two by "ke" than by "ko." *E.gr.* "Yahūdioñ ne us ke mār ḍālne kī salāh kii," "the Jews took counsel to slay him," lit. "the Jews made a counsel of the slaying of him;" thus making "him" the indirect, rather than the direct, object of "slaying." Here "us ko" would not be wrong; but "us ke" is better.

Ke better than Ko

4. The declension of this infinitive in gender and number is observed throughout Hindustan; but it is the *rule* only in the *West*. In the East it is as good to say "Mujhe chiṭṭhī likhnā hai" as to say "Mujhe chiṭṭhī likhnī hai."

Declined

Section 14—The Conjunctive Participle.

1. This, alone of all the forms of the verb, is not modified in any way by its relation to other words in the sentence. It has three forms: that produced by adding "ke" to the root, that produced by adding "kar" to the root, and the form which is identical with the root itself. "Ke" and "kar" are both, like the adjectival affix "kā" (see Chap. VII, section 2), derived from the Sanskrit root "kar," "to do;" so that "jāke" and "jākar" originally meant "having done a going." Of the two, "kar" has lately come to be considered the more elegant; perhaps because "ke" is apt, in some connexions, to be mistaken for the modification of "kā." But "karke" remains

Conjunctive Participle

the rule; because "karkar" sounds cacophonous. As to the form which is identical with the bare root, we have said in Chap. XII, section 3, 1 that it has only come to be so by the elision of "i," which was the old sign of the conjunctive participle; thus: "yih chiṭṭhī sāhib ko de āo," "give this letter to the gentleman and come," was formerly "dei āo," or "dey āo." It is now used, apart from colloquial phrases like "de āo," mainly (1) to prevent tautology when several conjunctive participles come in one sentence; *e.gr.* "Itnā sun us ne ghar jāke apne sab paṛosiyoñ ko bulākar kahā," "having heard this he went home; and having called all his neighbours, said." (2) in a reduplication of the conjunctive participle; when the former word *must* be put in this form. *E.gr.* "having often done" cannot be "karke karke," but "kar karke;" "having taught many" cannot be "bahutoñ ko sikhākar sikhākar," but "sikhā sikhākar."

Turned into Finite Verb

2. The above is one way of avoiding tautology in the repetition of conjunctive participles. A more common one now is to break the sentence, as is done in the above English sentence, by turning one of the conjunctive participles into a finite verb. *E.gr.* "Yeshūʿ ne roṭī lii, aur barakat chāhkar toṛī, aur shāgirdoñ ko dekar kahā," "Jesus took the bread, and having asked a blessing brake [it], and having given [it] to the disciples said." Here it would be possible to put every one of the verbs, except the last, in the conjunctive participle; and in old Hindi books one still finds long strings of such participles, in the root form, in sentences; but the tendency now is to break it up, as in the sentence just given. (Where, however, conjunctive participles are connected together by "aur," no tautology is felt, and therefore no expedient is necessary to avoid it.)

3. Yet it still remains true, that foreigners are, generally speaking, much more sparing of the use of the conjunctive participle than natives are; that is, they connect two finite verbs with "aur," instead of putting the former in the participle. *E.gr.* most Europeans, saying to a servant what would be in English "shut the door, and come to me," say "Darwāza band karo aur mere pās āo;" whereas an Indian would say "Darwāzā band karke mere pās āo." But while imitating Indians in the much freer use of the conjunctive participle, it would be a mistake to go to the opposite extreme, and use it everywhere. *E.gr.* for "I washed, and now can see" one cannot say "maiñ dhokar ab dekh saktā hūñ," for the two acts are regarded as co-ordinate, *i.e.* the former is not simply the antecedent of the latter; but "us ne lāsh kī taraf mutwajjih hokar kahā," "he turned to the corpse and said," is right, because he turned simply as preliminary to speaking to the corpse.

Insufficiently used by Foreigners

4. The conjunctive participle always indicates, of course, some relation as existing between the action denoted by its verb, and that denoted by some other verb, with which it is connected. And, as a rule, the *subject* of both verbs is *the same.* Now, there are *five* relations between the two verbs, of which one or other is indicated by the conjunctive participle.

Indicates some Relation

(1) *Sequence in time;* this is the commonest of all the five. *E.gr.* "Darwāza band karke mere pās āo," "shut the door and come to me," *i.e.* "first shut the door and then come to me."

Sequence

(2) *Means* whereby the second action is performed. *E.gr.* "us ne pukārke kahā," "he said in a loud voice," lit. "he said by crying out;" "unhoñ ne anjīr ke patte joṛ joṛke langoṭ banā liye," "they made themselves aprons by joining fig-leaves together;" "maiñ aisī dushṭatā karke Parameshwar kā aparadhī kyoñ banūñ?", "Why should I become a transgressor against God by doing such wickedness?" Specially is this meaning of the conjunctive participle found in that of the verb "kahnā," and verbs of similar meaning; *i.e.* the speaking is not antecedent to the other action, but the means where by the other action is performed. *E.gr.* "Parameshwar ne yah kahke unheñ *āshīsh dīī*," "God blessed them in these words;" "us ne aur bahut sī bāteñ jatā jatākar unheñ nasīhat kiī," "he exhorted them with many other warning words." **Means**

(3) *Cause.* *E.gr.* "Tab, apne bhāī ke sneh se man bhar jāne ke kāran, aur yah sochkar ki maiñ kahāñ roūñ, Yūsuph phurtī se apnī koṭhrī meñ jāke wahāñ ro diyā," "Then, because his heart was filled with affection for his brother, and because he considered where he should weep, Joseph quickly entered his own room, and there gave vent to tears." **Cause**

(4) *The Reason* for an assertion or question. *E.gr.* "kyā maiñ Masīhī hoke jhūṭh bolūñ?", "should I, being a Christian, tell a lie?" *i.e.* "seeing I am a Christian, I ask the question;" "ye log pahārī hoke chorī se ḍarte haiñ," these people, being hillmen" (*i.e.* "because they are hillmen"), "are afraid to steal;" "Isrāīl kā ustād hokar kyā tū in bātoñ ko nahīñ jāntā?", "being a teacher of Israel, knowest not thou these things?", *i.e.* the reason for my surprise at thy ignorance is thy position as teacher. **Reason**

(5) *The Condition* of the other action being performed. *E.gr.* "Kyā koī apne shatru ko pāke kushal

Condition

se jāne detā hai?", "does any one, if he gets his enemy into his power, let him go in peace?"; "we sab milkar bīs hue," "if put together, they amounted to twenty," *i.e.* "altogether, they amounted to twenty."

Subject same as Principal Verb

5. We have said above that, as a rule, the subject of both verbs—the one in the form of a conjunctive participle, and the one to which it is attached—is the same. *E.gr.* for "the sun having set, the dew began to fall," we cannot say "sūraj ḍūbkar os girne lagī," because the subject of "ḍūbkar" is "sūraj," and that of "lagī" is "os." We must say "jab sūraj ḍūb gayā, tab os girne lagī," or "sūraj ke ḍūbne par os girne lagī." Yet there are exceptions to this rule. For "twenty minutes past seven" the idiomatic Hindustani is "sāt bajke jab bīs miniṭ ho gaye," or "ho jāeñge." Here, "sāt bajke" is what would be in Latin or Greek called an "absolute" clause, *i.e.* the subject of "bajke" is "sāt," while that of "ho gaye" is "bīs miniṭ." Again, instead of "sab milke bīs hue," as above, it would be equally good to say "sab milāke bīs hue;" where the *thought* must be "if one were to put them all together, they would prove to be twenty;" in other words, the subject of "milāke" is "koī" understood. But such expressions are very few; and therefore the foreigner should never use the conjunctive participle in an "absolute" clause, except in cases where he has good native authority for doing so.

6. Again, there are exceptions to the rule, that the conjunctive participle should belong to the subject at all. Sometimes it is attached to the *object* of a clause, whether the direct or indirect object. But all such cases are conditioned by perspicuity; in other words

they are permissible only when there is no possibility of mistaking the meaning. *E.gr.* "jab tak Ibn-i-Ādam ko bādshāh hokar āte hue nā dekh leñge," "till they see the Son of Man coming as king," lit. "coming, having become king."

Sometimes attached to Object

Here the collocation of the words precludes ambiguity; for if the sentence had run "jab tak bādshāh hokar Ibn-i-Adam ko āte hue na dekh lenge," it would have meant "till they, having become kings, see the Son of Man coming." Again, "chālīs din aur chālīs rāt fāqa karke, ākhir ko use bhūkh lagī," "having fasted forty days and forty nights, afterwards he felt hungry." In this English rendering, the sentence is regular; but in Hindustani the "karke" belongs to "use," which is the indirect object of "lagī." Similarly, "jaisī niʿmat ham ko Khudāwand Yeshūʿ Masīh par īmān lākar milī thī," "a gift of the same kind as we obtained on believing in the Lord Jesus Christ." Here again, the English is regular; but in Hindustani the conjuctive participle depends, not on the subject "niʿmat," but on the object "ham ko."

7. When a conjunctive participle is attached to a negative verb, it partakes of the negative quality of the latter. *E.gr.* "jo koī apnī salīb uṭhākar mere pichhe nahīñ chaltā," "whoever does not take up his cross and follow after me."

Partakes of negative Quality

In this English sentence, the negative which does duty for both verbs is attached immediately to the former; but in the Hindustani sentence, it is attached to the latter. But the meaning is the same. But because we attach the negative to the former verb, it requires a little courage to believe that, though we do not the same in Hindustani, still it really has a negative meaning. *E.gr.* "un logoñ se

ḍarkar mat bhāgo," "do not flee for fear of them," or "do not fear them and flee from them." Here a novice is tempted to think the meaning must be "though you fear them, do not flee," because there is no negative attached to "ḍarkar;" but this would be a mistake. Another example is "yadī tum Yahowā kī āgyā mānkar un ko satyānāsh na karo," "if you do not exterminate them in obedience to Jehovah's command."

When Conjunctive Participle Negative

8. But if the negative belongs in sense only to the conjunctive participle, then it must be attached to *it*; *e.gr.* "wuh apnā khānā na chakhkar bhāg gayā," "he fled away without tasting his food." Only it is more idiomatic in such cases to express the meaning by "be" or "bin" ("without"); *e.gr.* "wuh apnā khānā be" (or "bin") chakhe bhāg gayā." But in *no* case it is permissible to attach the negative to *both* the verb and the conjunctive participle.

Partakes Passive Quality

9. Similarly, when the conjunctive participle is attached to a passive verb, it partakes of the passive quality of the latter. Consequently, it must never be put in the passive form; but either in the simple, neuter form or, more idiomatically, in the active, causal form. *E.gr.* "let all the doors be shut, and the house left" is in Hindustani "sab darwāze band karke ghar chhoṛ diyā jāe." Here the subject of "karke" is the "chhoṛ denewālā" *implied* in the passive "chhoṛ diyā jāe." So, "that a great millstone be tied to his neck, and he be drowned in the deep sea" is "ki baṛī chakkī kā pāṭ us ke gale meñ bāndhkar wuh gahre samundar meñ ḍubo diyā jāe." Here, the subject of "bāndhkar" is not "wuh," though this word comes next to it; but the

"ḍubonewālā" implied in the passive "ḍubo dīyā jāe." It would not be misleading to use the neuter "bandhkar" here, and to a foreigner this might seem better; but "bāndhkar" is more idiomatic. At any rate, it could not be "bāndhā jākar;" in other words, the conjunctive participle and the verb to which it is attached *cannot both* be in the passive. Another example: "Yih tel bahut mol meñ bechkar kangāloñ ko bāṇṭā jā saktā thā," "this oil might have been sold for a great price, and distributed to the poor." Here, again, *we* use the passive of both verbs; but Hindustanis prefer to put the conjunctive participle in the active voice.

10. This principle, that a passive verb should have the conjunctive participle, which is attached to it, in the active voice is extended even to those cases, where a neuter verb takes the place of a passive one of the same meaning.

Even in Neuter Verbs

E.gr. "bahutoñ and thoṛoñ ke bīch jo jo bhāg baṇṭ jāeñ so chiṭṭhī ḍāl dālke mileñ," "the portions which will be distributed between the many and the few should be apportioned by lot." Here, "mileñ" stands for "diye jāeñ," or "bāṇṭe jāeñ;" and *therefore* the "ḍāl ḍālke," which would be regular only in the case of such passives following, is felt by a Hindustani to be quite right.

11. It is sometimes difficult for a foreigner to distinguish between the meaning of the conjunctive participle and that of a modified past participle; *e.gr.* between "wuh kitāb leke āyā" (or "le āyā") and "wuh kitāb liye hue āyā." Both mean "he brought a book;" but the former lays stress on his *first taking* the book, and then coming; whereas the latter emphasizes the fact

Difference from Past Participle

that he *had* the book *with* him as he came. Similarly, "wuh takiya dekar so gayā thā" and "wuh takiya diye hue soyā thā" both mean "he was asleep on a pillow;" but the former expresses the fact that he had first put a pillow under his head, and then gone to sleep; the latter, that he was sleeping with a pillow under his head. In fact, the modified past participle in such cases is *generally* best rendered in English by the use of the preposition "with."

12. The conjunctive participles of "baṛhnā" and "ghaṭnā" are employed just as if they were adjectives, meaning respectively "more," "greater," etc., and "less," "smaller," etc. *E.gr.* "Masīh Mūsā se bhī baṛhkar hai," "Christ is greater even than Moses;" "Is laṛāī se pahile, Angrezoñ kī senā âur sab senāoñ se ghaṭke thī," "before this war the English army was smaller than all other armies." But, as in these examples, these words can be used in these senses *only in the predicate* of a sentence.

Baṛhkar and Ghaṭkar

———

CHAPTER XVI.

CERTAIN VERBS.

Section 1.—The Substantive Verb and "Honā."

1. By the "substantive verb" we mean that which in English is the verb "to be," and in Hindustani consists of only two tenses, a present ("hūñ," "hai," "haiñ," and "ho") and an imperfect ("thā," "thī," "the," "thīñ"). As in English, so in Hindustani it has two different meanings, *viz.* existence, and the "copula" uniting the "subject" and the "predicate" of a sentence. An instance which combines the two meanings is Heb. 11: 6, "God is, and He is a rewarder of them that seek after Him." The first "is" denotes existence; it is equivalent to "God exists;" but the second "is" is a copula combining the subject "He" and the predicate "a rewarder of them that seek after Him."

The Substantive Verb

2. This substantive verb in Hindustani is treated as if it were only half a verb, not strong enough to bear the full weight which other verbs bear. Hence the conjunctive participle cannot be attached to it alone. *E.gr.* we cannot say "wuh zahr

Only half a Verb

khākar bīmār hai" for "he, having eaten poison, is ill;" but "wuh zahr khākar bimār huā hai," "has become ill," or "rahtā hai," "keeps ill."

Different from Honā

3. It is often said that the remaining tenses of the substantive verb are supplied from "honā;" and, as one of these is the infinitive, it is often said that "honā" means "to be." But this is a mistake. Very often, indeed, the best, or even the only, way of translating "honā" in English is by the corresponding tense of "to be;" but this is only a difference of idiom between the two languages, and does not prove that "honā" *itself* means "to be." *E.gr.* the future "hogā" generally means the same as "will be" or "shall be;" but it does not follow from this that "hogā" is the future of the verb, of which the present is "hai."

Derivation of the two

4. The fact is, that the present and imperfect of which we now speak are, notwithstanding their present unlikeness to each other, both derived from the Sanskrit root "as," whose original meaning was probably "to sit," and hence "to remain," "to subsist," "to exist." But the verb "honā" is derived from quite another root "bhū," which means "to become," or "to come to be." (In ordinary Hindustani "bhū" has become "ho;" but in the vernacular of Eastern Hindustan the past participle and simple past tense retain the "bh," though that form of it which appears in literary Hindi, *viz.* "bhayā," has made up for this by losing the *ū* of the Sanskrit.) In Latin and in English the substantive verb is in some forms derived from "as," and in others from "bhū:" thus "am," "art," "is," "are," "was" and "were" come from the former, and "be," "been," "being" from

the latter. Yet "be," in many connexions, retains a trace of its original meaning; *e.gr.* "I have been to Paris," meaning "I have gone to Paris," where "been" means "come to be." Per contra, "honā" very often (except in the present and imperfect) has the weaker meaning which we express by "to be;" but it never loses all trace of its real meaning, which is either to come into existence, or to assume a new form of existence (*i.e.* "to become").

Local Difference

5. In this matter there is a difference of usage between the East and the West. In the West, "honā" is used much more nearly in the sense of "to be" than in the East; in the latter the verb "rahnā" is generally used in such cases. See more on this subject in Section 14, 3 of this chapter.

Radical meaning of each

6. Foreigners, in learning Hindustani, find it very difficult to decide when to say "hai" or "haiñ," and when "hotā hai" or "hote haiñ;" for in English "is" and "are" are said indiscriminately, both where a native says "hai" or "haiñ," and where he says "hotā hai" or "hote haiñ." But one has only to consider whether, in saying "is" or "are," one means simple existence or the copula, or else becoming or coming to be. (This illustrates the great advantage of learning a new language, *viz.* that it compels one to *think* what one *means* in using one's own language.) The difficulty is just the same, in distinguishing between "thā" and "hotā thā," "the" and "hote the;" and the way of resolving the difficulty is just the same.

7. This consideration will be helped by observing two rules. One is, that when we refer to a similar act

or event which takes or took place *several times*, we must use the present or imperfect of "honā," and not those of the substantive verb. *E.gr.* "Thy will is fulfilled in heaven" cannot be "Terī marzī āsmān meñ pūrī hai," but "hotī hai;" because the fulfilling of God's will takes place in a number of successive or contemporaneous, but in any case *separate*, acts.

First Rule

8. The other rule is, that where classes, rather than individuals, are spoken of, there the present or imperfect of "honā" must be used. *E.gr.* "crows are black," "mangoes are sweet," are in Hindustani not "kawwe kāle haiñ," "ām mīṭhe haiñ," which could only mean that certain crows, of which one is speaking, or certain mangoes, to which one is referring, are respectively black and sweet; but "kawwe kāle hote haiñ," "ām mīṭhe hote haiñ. Really, this second rule springs from the first; for the literal meaning of "ām mīṭhe hote haiñ" is that each mango, as it comes into existence or grows, becomes sweet. *We* do not think of it in that way; but Hindustanis do, though they may not be able to express this thought. Another example: "Panjāb meñ anāj bahut hotā hai" means that the Panjab is a good corn-bearing land; whereas "Panjāb meñ bahut anāj hai" would only mean that it happens that at the moment there is much corn in the Panjab; which may or may not be true; whereas the former statement is always true. So again, "the disciple is not greater than his teacher," if by this we are referring to a certain individual and his teacher, is "shāgird apne ustād se baṛā nahīñ hai;" but if we mean disciples as a class, whenever and wherever found, then we must say "shāgird apne ustād se baṛā nahīñ hotā."

Second Rule

9. "Honā" is used, both in the present participle and in the conjunctive participle, in the sense of "through;" only, however, in the literal, physical sense of this preposition. The present participle is used when what is passed through is a country or region, and what is reached through it is either in that region or adjoining it; *e.gr.* "wuh us tamām ṭāpū meñ hote hue Pāfus tak pahunche," "passing through that whole island, they arrived at Paphos," which was in the island, but at the further end of it; "Pisidiyā meñ se hote hue Pamfūliyā meñ pahunche," "passing through Pisidia, they came into Pamphylia," which was another country, adjoining it. The conjunctive participle of "honā" is used when what is passed through is either a place or else a region which does *not* extend as far as the place or country finally arrived at; *e.gr.* "āp Lakhnaū se hoke Kalkatte jāenge, yā Ilāhābād se hoke?" "Will you go to Calcutta by way of Lucknow, or of Allahabad?"; "Maiñ Amerikā se hoke Yūrop ko jāūngā," "I will go to Europe by way of America."

Meaning "through"

10. "Honā" is used, with the infinitive of another verb, to denote the necessity of performing an action,—a necessity neither that of physical compulsion on the one hand, nor simply that of moral obligation. *E.gr.* when Christ said to St. Paul, "jaise tū ne Yarūshalem meñ merī gawāhī dii hai, waisā hī Romā meñ bhī denī hogī," "as thou hast testified of me at Jerusalem, so must thou at Rome also," He neither meant that he would *have* to do so willy-nilly, nor did He *only* mean that he *ought* to do so. It was something between the two. He would indeed be compulsorily transported to Rome, and *there* it would be laid upon his heart to preach voluntarily. Again, "Afsos hai ki mujhe āp ko yih dard-angez

Meaning "necessity"

khabar denī huī," "Alas that I have had to give you this painful news!" Here, the giving of the news is regarded, certainly not as physically compulsory, yet not *simply* as a duty; but as a kind of logical necessity caused by circumstances, yet within one's own power to do, or not to do.

Equivalent to "Jānā"

11. As, in English, we say "I have been to Paris" in the sense of "I have gone to Paris," so "honā" in many connexions, is practically equivalent to "jānā." *E.gr.* "Maiñ shahr meñ ho āyā," "I have been in town," lit. "having been in, *i.e.* having gone to, town, I have come."

"Maʿlūm" with "hai" and "hota hai"

12. The difference between "hai" and "hotā hai" is perhaps nowhere more clear than when these words are preceded by "maʿlūm," which is an Arabic participle meaning "known." "Maʿlūm hai" means "it is known," "I know it;" but "maʿlūm hotā hai" means "*it seems*," "I *think* so." Apparently the *process* of *becoming* known is in this phrase taken to imply *imperfection* in the *knowing*.

Section 2—The Verb "Karnā."

Various Meanings

1. This verb is often used, where we use "to put," "to turn," or some verb other than "to do" and "to make." *E.gr.* "turn your face this way" is not "apnā muñh is taraf phero," but "is taraf *karo*;" "Rāhel and Yūsuph ko sab ke pīchhe *karke* wuh āp un ke āge barhā," "having *put* Rachel and

Joseph behind all, he himself went on in front of them;" "us ne Shimon ko nikālkar un ke sang *kar diyā*," "he brought Simeon out, and *set* him with them;" "logoñ ko apnī taraf *karke* Paulus ko sangsār kiyā," "they *got* the people on their side, and stoned Paul;" "unhoñ ne merī āgyāeñ apne pīchhe *kar* diīñ," not "phenk diīñ," though we say in English, "they *cast* my commandments behind their back."

2. It is used instead of "kahnā" when the word, or other sound uttered, is mentioned as its object; *e.gr.* "hāñ kī jagah hāñ karo," "say yes on the occasion (lit. place) for saying yes;" "unhoñ ne jay jay kiyā," "they cried Hurrah." Also, the most idiomatic expression for "to speak" is "bāteñ karnā," not "bāteñ kahnā."

3. "Karnā" means not only "to do," but also "to make;" *i.e.* it is used very often where we say "to make," and therefore are inclined to use "banānā" rather than "karnā." *E.gr.* "He made him a disciple" is "Us ne use shāgird kar diyā;" "kyā āp mujhe Musalmān kar lenge?", "will you make me a Musalmān?"

It will be seen from these examples, that "karnā" is not often used alone in this sense, but in composition with either "denā" or "lenā." *E.gr.* "he made him as bad as himself" is "us ne us ko apne barābar kharāb kar diyā." But "to take a wife" is "strī karnā;" "he took her to wife" is "us ne us ko strī kiyā."

4. "Karnā" means something different when construed with "se" from what it does when connected with "ko." The former denotes "dealing with a person or thing; the latter, "making" him or it "into" something. We ask "what have you done *with* it?" when we are quite prepared to hear that it has been destroyed; but this in Hindustani is

With Se or Ko

"tum ne," not "us se," but "us *ko*," "kyā kiyā ?" On the other hand, "to treat a person badly" is "us *se* kuvyavahār," or "badsulūkī, karnā."

5. "Karke" is often used for the English "as," when this refers to the *object* of the sentence or clause.

"Karke"="As"

E.gr. "Phiraun kī putrī ne us ko apnā beṭā karke pālā," "Pharaoh's daughter brought him up *as* her own son." See, further, in Chap. XIX, 2 (1).

6. In some parts of Hindustan, "karke" is used in the sense of "named," as "nām" is used, just after the name referred to; *e.gr.* "Rāmdās *karke* ek Panḍit mere pās āe the," "a Pandit called Rāmdās came to me."

=Nām

Section 3—The Verb "Jānā."

1. This is the only Hindustani verb, different forms of which are derived from different roots; the past participle and simple past being derived from the Sanskrit root "gam," whereas the rest of the verb comes from the root "yā." This combination of two verbs in one is very familiar to students of Latin and Greek; in English it is rare but exists; *e.gr.* "be" and "is" come from different roots (see the last section but one), and so do "go" and "went." And in Hindustani it is confined to one single verb.

Irregular Forms

2. We have already explained the use of "jānā" in the passive voice of other verbs, (see Chap. XV,

section 12), and in composition with other verbs (see Chap. XIV); so now it only remains to speak of its use with the present participle of another verb. It means "to *go on*" doing what the other verb imports. But so does "rahnā" with the present participle of another verb; but the difference is that, while "rahnā" denotes simply *continuance*, "jānā" implies that the action *increases* in intensity, or otherwise. *E.gr.* "why do you go on teasing me?" is not "tum mujhe kyūñ satāte jāte ho," but "satāte rahte ho," because it is not meant that the teasing increases in intensity, but simply that it continues. But "shāgird bahut hote jāte the" means that they went on increasing in what we call "geometrical progression." So "Kalīsiyā kī taraqqī hotī gaī," "the Church advanced more and more;" "akāl ghor hotā gayā," "the famine became ever worse and worse."

With Present Participle

Section 4—The Verb "Chalnā."

1. The radical meaning of this verb is *movement*, whether rapid or slow, and whether the *chalnewālā* is alive, and moves of his own will, or inanimate, and has to be carried or drawn. Only, it must move as a whole; if only a part of a person or thing moves, then that part "chal"s, and perhaps the whole "chalā"s it; but the whole does not itself "chal." Hence "hawā chal rahī hai," "the wind is blowing" (lit. "the air is moving"); "gāṛī chalne lagī," "the carriage has begun to move," are as proper as "fauj chal rahī hai," "the army is on the march;" "ghoṛā chalne lagā," "the horse has begun to walk." It is rightly said, in Acts 14: 8, of the man born lame that

Denotes Movement

he "kabhī na chalā thā," for though he had moved his arms and other parts of his body, he had never been able to *stir*. But a coin "bāzār meñ chalegā" or "na chalegā," "it will pass" or "it will not pass;" lit. "it will move freely," *i.e* "circulate."

Not "to walk"

2. Foreigners must beware of thinking that "chalnā" is equivalent to "to walk," in the sense of a *particular mode* of movement, and distinguished from running, riding, flying, sailing, etc. *E.gr.* In Is. 40: 31, where "walking" is distinguished from flying and running, the translations in the current versions, both Urdu and Hindi, "we chalenge aur sust na honge," "we chalte chalte thak na jāenge," are *wrong*. The only way of distinguishing walking from running, or other mode of procedure when one moves oneself, is saying "qadam qadam chalnā;" and the only way of distinguishing walking from those modes of procedure, in which one is carried on something else, is "pāoñ pāoñ chalnā" or "paidal chalnā," "paidal" being an adjective, answering to our "on foot."

"Starting"

3. From the original meaning of movement comes that of *starting, setting out*, whether or no this is followed by arrival at one's destination. *E.gr.* "Yeshū' wahāñ se chalkar Galīl kī jhīl ke nazdīk āyā," "Jesus set out from there, and came to the neighbourhood of the Lake of Galilee." In Gen. 12: 4 and 5 it is said three times of Abram and his belongings, that they "chale;" but only at the end of ver. 5 is it said that they "Kanān desh meñ ā gaye," "came into the land of Canaan." They *might* have started from Haran, without ever reaching Canaan. So again, Abraham "kūch karke us sthān ko chalā,"

where he was to offer up Isaac, as soon as he received the command to do so; but it was on the third day that he saw the place, and even then it was a long way off. So Joseph "apne bhāiyoñ ke pās chalā," but he had not reached them when they conspired against him. In Gen. 43: 17 it is important to notice the use of "chalnā;" for if, instead of saying that the steward "un purushoñ ko Yūsuph ke ghar meñ le chalā," the writer had said "le gayā," this would have contradicted ver. 19, where he says that they went near to the door of that house, and also ver. 24, where he says that the steward took them into the house. Similarly, in Gen. 48: 1 it is said that Joseph "chalā" to see his father; if "gayā" had been used, it would have contradicted the following statement, that some one told Jacob that Joseph *was coming* to see him.

4. From the idea of starting comes the use of "chalnā" and "chalānā," when said of opinions, customs, etc. when a vogue comes to them among men. The literary Urdu of this is "jārī honā" and "jārī karnā," (lit. "to be, and to make, flowing"); but all Hindustanis understand "chalnā" and "chalānā" in this sense. *E.gr.* "Us ne apne gāñw meñ apnā mat chalāyā," "He spread his doctrine in his own village."

Vogue

5. From the same meaning of "chalnā" comes an important difference between it and "jānā." If we say of a person that he "buṛhā gayā," we mean that he has already *become* old; but if we say "buṛhā chalā," we mean only that he has begun to age, lit. he has started getting old. So we say of rotten fruit, that it "saṛ gayā;" but if it has only begun to decay, and most of it is still eatable, we say "saṛ chalā." Simi-

Beginning

larly, we may say of a woman of 30, that "us kī jawānī ḍhal gaī hai," "her youth has passed away;" but if she is only 20, that "us kī jawānī ḍhal chalī hai."

6. "Chalnā" also, in certain connexions, implies that the "chalnewālā" is going, or to go, *along with* the speaker, or the person spoken to or of. Moses said to Hobab, "tū bhī hamāre sang chal," "come thou also with us;" where "jā" would be inadmissible, and "ā," though not wrong, less idiomatic than "chal." So "chalo" or "chaliye," said to a person, *implies* that one is oneself going to the same place, or at least in the same direction, even though this be not expressed in words.

Accompaniment

Section 5—The Verb "Paṛnā."

1. The original meaning of this verb is "to fall;" *e.gr.* the common phrase "pānī paṛegā," "it will rain," lit. "water will fall." It is also used in composition with "girnā" (which is comparatively seldom used in any but the literal sense of "to fall"), *viz.* "gir paṛnā," "to fall down." But "paṛnā" is used also in a great variety of figurative meanings, some of which are not easy to trace to the original meaning of the verb.

Radical Meaning

2. When connected with another verb in the infinitive, "paṛnā" signifies the same kind of necessity to perform the action denoted by the infinitive verb, as we have explained above about the use of "honā" with an infinitive; only "paṛnā" is *stronger* than "honā"

Necessity

in this connexion; and in some parts of Hindustan "paṛnā" alone, and never "honā," occurs in this sense. *E.gr.* "jidhar hawā chaltī hai, udhar hī bādaloñ ko jānā paṛtā hai," "in whatever direction the wind blows, the clouds *have* to go in the same direction." But if said of persons, who have a will of their own, the necessity denoted by "paṛnā" must act through that will; *e.gr.* "tum ko wahāñ jānā paṛegā," "you will *have* to go there;" which does not mean that "I will by main force carry you there," but "I will threaten you with such punishment or offer you such inducements, that of your own will you will choose to go there." So also, "mujhe us se Fārsī meñ bāteñ karnī paṛīñ," "I *had* to speak to him in Persian," because he understood no other language. Yet if the speaker, knowing this, chose to waste his own breath by speaking in another language, he was free to do so.

Object of an action

3. When connected with another verb in the bare root form, *i.e.* when it forms the second member of a compound verb, "paṛnā" has several meanings. Perhaps the nearest to the sense of "falling" is in "nikal paṛnā," *e.gr.* "us kī sab antriyāñ nikal paṛīñ," "all his bowels fell out," lit. "came out and fell." Next to such instances we may place its use with verbs which signify some act of consciousness, *e.gr.* "dekh paṛnā," "to be an object of sight;" "sun paṛnā," "to be an object of hearing;" "jān paṛnā," "to be an object of consciousness," "to seem;" "samajh paṛnā," "to be understood." In the use of these compound verbs Hindustani is, as usual, more accurate than English. *E.gr.* we say "to see" *both* of the intentional direction of the eye upon some object—really, an *act* of the *mind* and *will*—, and *also* in the sense that an object is within the range of our vision, that it is an object of our sight. But Hindustanis,

while expressing the former by "dekhnā," signify the latter by "dekh paṛnā," the thing seen being the subject of this verb. *E.gr.* "kyā āp ko āsmān par wuh sitāra dekh paṛtā hai?", "do you see that star in the sky?", "hāñ, dekh paṛtā hai," "yes, I see it." The same rule applies to "sun paṛnā," "jān paṛnā," etc. In one word, where the stress is rather on the object than on the subject, the compound with "paṛnā" is used; when it is rather on the subject, the simple verb without "paṛnā" is employed. There are other verbs also, to which in the bare root form "paṛnā" is added; not however of necessity, but to increase the force; *e.gr.* "nothing avails," "I cannot succeed," is often expressed by "kuchh nahīñ bantā" (see section 7 of this Chapter); but more commonly by "kuchh ban nahīñ paṛtā."

4. Often "paṛnā" occurs in the sense of "honā," apparently because it is rather more forceful, or pictorial. *E.gr.* "akāl paṛā," "there arose a famine" (in this case the figures employed in Hindustani and English are opposites); "phūṭ paṛ gaī," "a schism took place;" "sab kī zanjīreñ ḍhīlī paṛ gaīñ," "the chains of all became loose." With words denoting calamity, "paṛnā" is *the* verb to use; as we say "a calamity *fell* upon me." A peculiar use of "paṛnā" is found in "wuh kīṛe paṛkar mar gayā," "he was eaten of worms and died," lit. "he fell worms and died."

Instead of "Honā"

5. Names are attached to places and other things (sometimes even person) in two different ways. Sometimes they are deliberately and purposely attached, and sometimes they *get* their names, somehow, without any one purposely giving them to them. In the former case, the Hindustani

In naming Objects

verb to be used is "rakhnā" (see section 15 of this chapter); but in the latter, it is "paṛnā." *E.gr.* Zoar (Gen. 19 : 22), Beersheba (Gen. 21 : 31), and Akeldama (Acts 1 : 19) received their names in this latter way, and therefore "paṛnā" is used to describe their receiving them.

"Lying"

6. In the past tenses other than the imperfect, "paṛnā" often means "to lie," though there may have been no "fall" preceding the recumbent posture. Hence to say of a person "wuh paṛā hai" means that "he is ill." So of a country; *e.gr.* "kyā sārā desh tere sāmhne paṛā nahīñ hai?" means "does not the whole land *lie* before thee?" And in one kind of case the *present* is used, *viz.* of a place *lying on* a certain road, *e.gr.* "Mansūrī ke mārg meñ Dehrā paṛtā hai," "Dehra *lies* on the way to Mussoorie;" probably because it is regarded as falling, *i.e.* coming, in the way of *every* traveller along that road. Hindustanis, like ourselves, speak of land "*lying* waste;" "zamīn wīrān paṛī hai," or simply "paṛī hai." Yet, strangely, "paṛtī zamīn" is the word for "fallow land;" where one would rather have expected "paṛī zamīn," "land *lying*" (as we say) useless.

Section 6.—The Verb "Lagnā."

Radical meaning

1. The radical meaning of this verb is "to come into contact" with a person or thing; and, of course, "lagānā" is "to bring into contact." But from this radical meaning has arisen a great variety of idiomatic uses of the verb; some more, some less, plainly arising from the idea of contact, which may

be either violent or gentle. We can indicate only a few of these various uses of "lagnā;" others must be acquired by the learner, gradually, from his own experience.

2. Idioms which imply simple contact, without any violence, are "nāw ko tīr par lagānā," "to bring the boat to land," lit. "to bring it into contact with the shore;" "yih mere hāth lagā hai," "I have received this," as we say "It has come to hand to me;" "gale lagnā," "to embrace," lit. "to come into contact with" some one's "neck."

Gentle contact

3. In other idioms, the contact implied is a violent one. *E.gr.* "patthar mujhe nahīñ lagā," "the stone did not strike me;" "bahut se bed lagwākar," "having causes many stripes to be laid on them with a cane." So "hāth lagānā" means "to lay violent hands" on some one. Even "choṭ," "a knock," requires "lagnā," *e.gr.* "mujhe bhārī choṭ lagī," "I am badly bruised."

Violent contact

4. "Lagnā" is also used of proximity, even when the contact is not complete. *E.gr.* "Dān ke siwāne se lagā huā Asher kā ek bhāg ho," "let there be a portion for Asher *next to* the border of Dan;" "us kā ghar mere ghar se lagā hai," "his house is next to mine" (where there would probably be a space between them).

Proximity

5. It is also used of sensation, whether bodily or mental, with an adjective describing the quality of the sensation, *e.gr.* "achchhā lagtā hai," "it pleases," *i.e.* "I like it;" "burā lagtā hai," "I dislike it;" "mīṭhā

lagtā hai," "it tastes sweet" (We may compare the curious use of "to strik" in English; *e.gr.* "this strikes me as very good," etc.). So,

Sensation

"man" (or "dil") "nahīñ lagtā," "I don't take to (this)," lit. "(my) mind does not come into contact (with it)."

6. "Lagnā" is also used where we say that a person is "engaged" for some work. *E.gr.* if one calls a coolie to work for one, and he is already engaged to some one else to work for him, he will say "maiñ lagā hūñ." So, "to engage" a person is "lagānā;" *e.gr.* "wuh apnī dākhbārī meñ mazdūroñ ko lagāne gayā," "he went to engage hirelings in his vineyard."

Engagement

7. When joined with another verb in the modified infinitive which ends in "ne," "lagnā" means "to begin" to do the action, which the other verb denotes. For to begin an act, or course of similar acts, is (as it were) to come into contact with it. But there is this difference between the use of "lagnā" in Hindustani, and "to begin" in English, that the latter generally implies *only* beginning *and not finishing* an action; whereas the former has no such implication. When the former meaning is intended, it is expressed otherwise in Hindustani; *e.gr.* "is shakhs ne ʿimārat banānī shurūʿ to kii, magar taiyār na kar sakā," "this person began indeed to build, but could not finish." It is true that the action denoted by the verb in the infinitive *may* last a very short time; but the use of "lagnā" ignores the question of the length or shortness of the action, and merely states that it is begun. *E.gr.* "Wuh kaṭore ko Phiraun ke hāth meñ dene lagā," "he resumed the practice of giving the cup into Pharaoh's hand;" "Yūsuph bhaṇ-

Commencement

ḍāroñ ko khol kholke Misriyoñ ke hāth ann bechne lagā," "Joseph opened all the store-houses, and commenced selling corn to the Egyptians" (and continued doing so as long as the famine lasted). When his brethren sat at the table with him, "we us ke sang pīne aur ānand karne lage," and certainly kept up their merriment as long as the meal lasted.

8. Sometimes "lagnā" is used with a modified infinitive, where not even actual commencement of an action is meant, but only preparedness for it. *E.gr.* "Yūhannā yih kahkar use manaʿ karne lagā," "John *was going* to forbid Him, saying," when he was prevented from even beginning to do so by Christ's reply. So, "Patras us kā dahinā hāth pakaṛkar us ko uṭhāne lagā," "Peter, taking hold of his right hand, *prepared* to raise Him up;" but there was no need for him even to begin to do so, for the man's "feet and ankle-bones received strength," and without Peter's help he leaped up and stood.

Preparedness

9. "Lagnā" is often connected with "kahnā," and other verbs which mean the same thing, in the modified infinitive, where it is difficult to see why "lagnā" is added at all. Sometimes, indeed, as in "Phiraun Yūsuph se kahne lagā," "apnī zabān kholkar unheñ yih taʿlīm dene lagā," "opened his mouth and taught them, saying," it may be due to the length of the following discourse; but this explanation does not apply in all those instances, where yet there is no doubt that it is thoroughly idiomatic.

With "kahnā"

10. "Lagnā" and "lagānā" are often used in the sense of "attributing" and "being attributed." "Kisī par dosh" or "qusūr lagānā" is "to accuse some one

of a fault;" "tuhmat" or "apawād lagānā" is "to accuse falsely," "to slander." But "yih pāp tumheñ lagā rahegā" means more than attribution from outside; it means "this sin will adhere to you," *i.e.* "you will remain *guilty* of it."

Attribution

Section 7—The Verb "Bannā."

1. "Bannā" radically means "to be made," "to come into a made state" (see Chap. XIII, 1), and "banānā," "to make." This is why Hindustani, more accurate than English (or rather, perhaps, leaving less to the imagination), inserts "banā" to signify that a thing is not real, but artificial; *e.gr.* it is said in Hindi of Solomon's throne, "donoñ ṭekoñ ke pās ek ek siñh kharā huā *banā* thā," where the English is "there was a lion standing by each of the stays," because we know they were not real lions, and therefore need not add the word "made."

Radical Meaning

2. But these words *also* mean "*to repair*," and "to be repaired," of a thing once made, but afterwards more or less marred. *E.gr.* where we say "Repairs going on" on a road, Hindustanis say "Saṛak ban rahī hai."

Repair

3. Also they denote *success* in any operation or plan or hope; as in the example given in section 5, 3 of this Chapter, "kuchh ban nahīñ paṛtā," "nothing avails." In this sense "bannā" is the opposite to "bigaṛnā" (to be spoilt), and "banānā" the opposite to

Success

"bigāṛnā" (to spoil). To a Hindu, "merā paralok banegā," lit. "my future world will be alright," is equivalent to "I shall be saved;" and "merā paralok bigṛegā" equivalent to "I shall be lost." So, to help another to succeed is "baṇānā" him; to prevent his success is "bigāṛnā" him. For "what harm have I done you, that you speak so to me," a Hindustani says "Maiñ ne tumhārā kyā bigāṛā hai, ki tum mujh se aisī bāteñ kahte ho?"

Pretence

4. "Bannā" and "banānā" are also, somewhat like our "make out" and "make up," used to express pretence, putting a character on, posing as something; and making another person out to be what he is not. *E.gr.* "wuh rājā ban baiṭhā," "he gave himself out to be king," or "he acted as if he were king;" "Yūsuph ne un ke sāmhne anjān bankar kaṭhoratā ke sāth un se pūchhā," "Joseph, pretending before them that he did not know them, asked them roughly;" "āp kyā mujhe chor banāte haiñ?" "do you make me out to be a thief;" "āp apnā darāz khulā huā na chhoṛiye, nahīñ to ham log chor baneñge," "do not leave your drawer open, else we shall be taken for thieves;" *not* "we shall *become* thieves," which would imply a conscientiousness not to be expected from Indian servants.

Continuance

5. In the past participle, "bannā" also gves the meaning of *continuance*, specially when joined with "rahnā." *Egr.* "wuh chupchāp banā rahā," "he remained silent." Here "chupchāp rahā" would mean the same thing; but the insertion of "banā" emphasizes the continuance in the state of silence, without change; doubtless because when a thing is *made*, it is not soon altered, as a rule.

Section 8—The Verbs "Kahnā" and "Bolnā."

Difference

1. "Kahnā" differs from "bolnā" in that the former is limited to human speech, while the latter is used of *any* kind of sound, emitted by animals as well as men, and by inanimate things as well as animate; *e.gr.* "bādal bolā," "the cloud uttered a sound," *i.e.* "it thundered;" "pahiyā boltā hai," "the wheel squeaks." From this it will be seen that "bolnā" has no one equivalent in English, but must be translated differently according to the context. Indeed, for "speaking" or "talking," while "bolnā" may be used, and often is used, yet it is more idiomatic to say "bāteñ karnā," lit. "to make words."

Transitive and Intransitive

2. As a rule, "kahnā" is transitive, like the English "to say;" and "bolnā" intransitive, like our "to speak." But the rule is not without exceptions. On the one hand, "kahnā" sometimes occurs without an object, *e.gr.* "jab Mūsā aur Hārūn ne Phiraun se kahā," "when Moses and Aaron spake to Pharaoh." On the other hand, quotations are frequently introduced by "bolnā" instead of "kahnā;" *e.gr.* "kyā tum ne zamīn itne hī ko bechī thī? wuh bolī, hāñ, itne hī ko," "did you sell the land for just so much? she said, yes, for so much."

Different Meanings

3. "Kahnā" has two different meanings, *viz.* (1) "to say" or "to speak," and (2) "to call," *i.e.* "to give a name to" somebody or something. In the former sense it *must* take "se" with the person spoken to. This rule was not observed by the early missionaries, and as a consequence we still have

some translations in which "ko" is used with the person addressed; but this is wrong. It is, indeed, a natural error for foreigners to fall into; for we speak "*to*" a person, and say a word "*to*" him. But "se" here means not "from," but "with" [see Chap. IV, 11 (2)]; and saying or speaking always implies *connexion with* the person addressed; as we say "to talk *with* a person." An apparent, but only apparent, exception to this rule is in *sending* a salutation from one person to another at a distance; *e.gr.* "Gayus tumheñ salām kahtā hai," "Gaius salutes you;" for Gaius could not say "salām" *to* the Romans, but only say it to St. Paul *for* them.

4. When, however, "kahnā" means "to call," it *must* take "ko" with the person or thing named. *E.gr.*

To call

"Parameshwar ne ujiyāle ko din aur andhiyāre ko rāt kahā," "God called the light day, and darkness night;" "us ne mujh ko badma'āsh kahā," "he called me a disreputable person." As we have already observed (chap. XIII, 6), the causal of "kahnā," *viz.* "kahānā" or "kahlānā," is used for the passive of "kahnā" in *this* sense, rather than the regular passive "kahā jānā," *viz.* "wuh Pandit kahlātā hai," "he is called a Pandit;" "ki ham Khudā ke farzand kahlāeñ," "that we should be called God's children."

5. "Kahnā" is *not*, generally speaking, used of *mental* saying, as it often is in English. To "say in one's heart" is better rendered by "sochnā" than by "dil meñ kahnā."

Not mental

Section 9.—The Verbs "Chhūṭnā" and "Bachnā."

1. Both these verbs mean "to be saved," and both their causals, "chhuṛānā" aur "bachānā," mean "to save;" and therefore foreigners are apt to use the one for the other. But "to save," in English, means two different things; and the Hindustani for the one is "chhuṛānā," and for other is "bachānā." "To save" may either mean to *deliver* a person or thing *out of* some evil, in which he or it is *already* involved; or it may mean to *preserve* a person or thing *from* some evil, which as yet only *threatens* to come upon him or it. In the former sense, "to save" is "chhuṛānā," and "to be saved" "chhūṭnā," in the latter, "to save" is "bachānā," and "to be saved" "bachnā." Now, Christ is our Saviour in both senses; He preserves us from hell, and also from many sins, and other evils, in the present life; but He also delivers us from thraldom to sin and Satan, and will deliver us from all the suffering in which we are now involved. In other words, He is both "Bachānewālā" aur "Chhuṛānewālā;" and we, by Him, both "bach" and "chhūṭ." But the exclusive, or at least predominant, use of the title "Bachānewālā" for our Saviour has wofully fallen in with the Indian tendency to look upon salvation rather as preservation from the punishment of sin than as deliverance from the grasp and tyranny of sin. This mistake has been aided by the translation of Matt. 1 : 21 in the older versions, "Wuh apne logoñ ko un ke gunahoñ se bachāegā." For, seeing that all Jews then looked for the Messiah as one who should deliver them from that subjugation to the Romans *under which* they groaned, it is practically certain that the angel meant *this* kind of salvation; only substituting "sins" for "Romans," as worse enemies and oppressors.

Difference of meaning

2. "Bachānā" is the right word to use for, *e.gr.* "saving" money, because this means preserving it from being spent; or "keeping" food from one meal to another, because this is preserving it from being eaten at once. And if a soldier escapes with his life in battle, he "bach gayā," because he is preserved from the death which threatened him. And if a person is very ill, but recovers; whereas *we* should suppose "chhūṭnā" to be right, because he is delivered *out of* his sickness, Hindustanis on the contrary say "wuh bach gayā," because they are thinking of his being preserved from the jaws of *death* which threatened him. On the other hand to "redeem" either a slave out of bondage, or an article of property out of pawn, is "chhuṛānā."

Varia

Section 10.—The Verbs "Pūchhnā," "Māngnā," and "Chāhnā."

1. "Pūchhnā" means "to ask (a question);" but it is construed differently, according to whether it means "to ask (a question) *of*" some one, or "to inquire *for*" a person or thing. In the former sense, it must take "se" with the person asked, because asking him is endeavouring to elicit information *from* him. *E.gr.* "Tū mujh se kyoñ pūchhtā hai? sunnewāloñ se pūchh, ki maiñ ne un se kyā kahā," "why askest thou me? ask my hearers, what I said to them." But in the latter tense, it must take "ko," or the noun without a postposition, with the person or thing inquired for; *e.gr.* "Shamaʿūn kā ghar pūchhte pūchhte us ke darwāze par khare ho gaye," "they went on asking for Simon's house, and at last stood at his door;" "wuh āp ko pūchhne ke liye āyā thā," "he came to enquire about you."

Different meanings of "Pūchhnā"

1. "Pūchhnā" is more regularly used in introducing a question than "to ask" is in English. In fact, we never use this verb before a *direct* question. We say "he asked me where I was going;" but we do *not* say "he asked me, where are you going?" but rather "he said to me, where are you going?" In Hindustani, however, in which quotations are almost always *direct* (see chap. XXXVIII, section 1), while "kahnā" is not incorrect, "pūchhnā" is more idiomatic. Thus the above sentence will be "unhoñ ne mujh se pūchhā ki Āp kahāñ jā rahe haiñ?"

Regular use

3. "The English verb "to ask" is used in two senses, *viz.* to ask a question, and to *ask for* a thing. In Hindustani, however, "pūchhnā" only has the former meaning; the latter is expressed either by "māngnā" or by "chāhnā." The Arabic word "sawāl" is, indeed, used in Urdu in both senses; but ordinary people use it only in the sense of a "question," and "sawāl karnā" in that of "asking a question."

Asking for

4. The ordinary meaning of "chāhnā" is "to wish," "to desire;" but, like "to desire" in English, it *also* means to ask for something, *i.e.* to *express* one's wish for it. In this sense "chāhnā" is often a better word to use than "māngnā;" *e.gr.* "to ask a blessing" from God is "barakat chāhnī," rather than "barakat māngnī." [Here it may be observed, that "barakat" is used only of a *divine* blessing; hence, when one man "blesses" another, it is wrong to say "barakat denā;" but "barakat chāhnā" is the right expression.] Also it should be observed, that "māngnā" is exclusively used in the sense of "to beg;" *i.e.* only an inferior can use it of speaking to a

Chāhnā and Māngnā

superior, not a superior with an inferior, or an equal with an equal. (Yet the double causal "mangwānā," "to send for" a thing, is used without any thought of inferiority or equality.) Another difference between "māngnā" and "chāhnā" is that the former can have for its object *only a noun, not an infinitive verb;* whereas the latter takes *both.* Hence "ham wahāñ jāne nahīñ māngte," which one hears often from Indians whose speech has been corrupted by contact with English, is wrong; it should be "maiñ wahāñ jāne nahīñ *chāhtā.*"

"Chāhe"

5. The word "chāhe," which is either the second or the third person singular of the subjunctive of "chāhnā"—*i.e.* either it originally meant "if thou wish," or "if one wish"—is used either singly or doubly, *i.e.* either in introducing the protasis of a conditional sentence in the sense of "though," or in introducing two alternative conditions in the sense of "whether" and "or." Not that "though" is always translateable by "chāhe." When the former word introduces a statement of fact, the Hindustani for it is in Hindi "yadyapi," and in Urdu "agarchi;" *e.gr.* "though I am ill, I will do this work for you," "agarchi maiñ bīmār hūñ, maiñ āp ke liye yih kām karūngā." (In Urdu, as in English, it is not necessary to express the apodosis "yet;" but in Hindi it *must* be expressed, by "taubhī" or "phir bhī.") But when "though" introduces a possibility or probability belonging to the future, it must be rendered in Hindustani by "chāhe." *E.gr.* "chāhe āp mujhe hazār dafa dhokhā deñ, taubhī maiñ āp ko na chhorūngā," "though you should deceive me a thousand times, yet will I not forsake you." But when "chāhe" is *doubled,* it may introduce any kind of statements, past, present, or future, as long as there is doubt, not necessarily about the statements themselves, but about the particular application of them.

E.gr. "yadi wuh mahāvyādhi kisī vastra ke chāhe tāne meñ chāhe bāne meñ harī sī ho," "if that plague be greenish in any cloth, whether in its warp, or in its woof;" "bakrī ko chāhe chhāwanī meñ chāhe chhāwanī se bāhar bali karke," "having sacrificed a goat, whether in the camp or outside it;" "kal chāhe pānī pare chāhe na bhī pare, taubhī maiñ bāhar jāūngā," "to-morrow I will go out, whether it rains or not."

"Chāhiye"

We have spoken of the word "chāhiye" in Chap. XIV, section 6. It only remains here to say that (1) in the West of Hindustan, but not in the East, it admits a plural, "chāhiyeñ;" and (2) it does not really admit a past tense. Some say "chāhiye thā," and some "chāhtā thā," in the sense of "it *was* proper," etc.; but both are obviously incorrect, the former in itself, and the latter in this sense; and the only correct way of expressing the above meaning is in Hindi "uchit thā," and in Urdu "munāsib thā," or "thā" with any other equivalent adjectives.

Section 11.—The Verbs "Milnā," "Pānā" and "Saknā."

1. "Milnā" means "to meet;" hence the noun "melā," "a meeting." But the special application of this general meaning depends on the postposition used with it.

"Milnā" with "se"

2. With "se," "milnā" denotes a meeting between *persons*; this "se" being connected with "sāth" [see Chapter IV: 11 (2)]. As a rule, the meeting expressed by "milnā" and

"se," is intentional; but in any case, there must be a certain amount of conversation, or personal dealing of some sort, following the meeting. *E.gr.* "wah jākar us se milā aur us ko chūmā," "he went and met him, and kissed him." The causal "milānā," however, is used also of impersonal things, which can have no conversation; *e.gr.* "wuh apne mazhab ke mas'ale Masīhī dīn ke mas'aloñ se" (or "ke sāth") milātā hai," "he mixes up the tenets of his own religion with those of Christianity."

3. With "meñ," "milnā" means *so* to be mixed, (and "milānā" means so to mix) that the result is the absorption of the one into the other, whether they be persons or things. Most milkmen "dūdh meñ pānī milāte haiñ," "mix water with their milk" (so that they cannot separate them without an instrument for the purpose; practically the water is absorbed in the milk); "Brahma meñ mil jānā" means "to be absorbed into Brahma" (the Pantheistic tenet of the Vedānta), otherwise expressed by "Brahma meñ līn ho jānā;" to say of a Christian that he "Hindūoñ meñ mil gayā" would mean that he had entered their community, *i.e.* become a Hindu, whereas to say "Hindūoñ se miltā hai" would only mean that he mixes with them, *i.e.* cultivates their acquaintance.

"Milnā" with "Meñ"

4. With "ko," "milnā," when the meeting is *between persons*, implies a meeting unintended and unexpected by one or both of the persons. Elijah's meeting with Obadiah, and again with Ahab in Naboth's vineyard, are instances of meeting unexpected by one of the parties. If a man happens to meet his servant in the bazar, he says

"Milnā" with "ko"

"wuh mujh *ko* bāzār meñ milā;" in this case the meeting was unexpected by both parties.

5. When, however, one or both of those who meet is *a thing*, or are *things*, then—except in the case of absorption, just mentioned—"ko" with "milnā" is the invariable rule. Where we say we "have found" a thing," Hindustanis generally say "wuh chīz mujh ko milī hai," lit. "that thing has met me." True, it is sometimes difficult to know where to render "to find" in this way, and where by "pānā," the regular transitive verb meaning "to find." "Pānā" comes from a Sanskrit verb which means originally "to reach;" accordingly "pānā" is appropriate where the finding is the result of diligent search, study, or effort of any kind. And yet, if one has lost a thing, and after a search finds it, one does not say "maiñ ne pāyā," but "mil gayā." "Pānā is "to *acquire*," which one could not say in this case. On the other hand, when one comes unexpectedly upon a thing, as the merchant in the parable did on the "pearl of great price," or as Hilkiah did on the Law in the Temple, "milnā" is the verb to use; *e.gr.* "mujhe ek pustak milī," "use ek beshqīmat motī milā." These remarks will *help* the learner to decide where to use "milnā," and where "pānā;" but there will remain many cases where only long familiarity with the language will make one quite certain which to use.

"Milnā" and "Pānā"

6. "Pānā," when construed with another verb, means "to be able" in the sense of the removal of obstacles which do, or are supposed to, prevent the desired action. This other verb is put either into the modified infinitive form, or remains as a bare root. In the former case "pānā" is an intransitive verb, *e.gr.* "tum

"Pānā"

mere sāmhne phir āne na pāoge," "you shall not again be allowed to come before me," *i.e.* "I will not allow you to come again;" "is laṛke kī santī maiñ terā dās hoke rahne pāūñ, aur laṛkā apne bhāiyoñ ke sang ghar jāne pāe," "let me remain as thy slave instead of this lad, and let the lad be allowed to go home with his brothers." In the latter case (which is much less common) "pānā" is a transitive verb, *e.gr.* "phir maiñ *ne* us kā muñh na dekh pāyā," "since then, I have not seen his face," *i.e.* not had the opportunity of seeing it.

7. The above examples illustrate the fact, that Hindustanis often use "pānā" in this sense where we do not feel it necessary to employ anything but the simple verb. Another example is St. Paul's admonition to Timothy, "Let no man despise thy youth," "koi terī jawānī haqīr nà jānne pāe." Here, if we translated "na jāne," it could only mean a prayer, or a wish, that other people might look on him kindly, and not contemptuously because of his youth. But, obviously, St. Paul meant this sentence as an *exhortation* to Timothy, that he should not act in such a manner as to tempt others to despise his youth, "Do not *give any one the opportunity* of despising thy youth" is the evident meaning; and this is, in Hindustani, "koī terī jawanī haqir na jānne pāe."

"Pānā"

8. In this sense, "pānā" is, *practically*, the passive of "denā," when the latter is used with a modified infinitive, in the sense of "allow." *E.gr.* one of the above sentences might well have been expressed thus, "mujhe is laṛke kī santī apnā dās hoke rahne, aur laṛke ko bhāiyoñ ke sang ghar jāne *de*," "*allow* me to remain as thy slave instead of this lad, and this lad to go home

"Pānā"

with his brothers." And here, a beginner should be careful to avoid a pitfall. We speak of "permission" in two different senses; in the sense of permission given with hearty approval, and in that of merely placing no obstacles in the way, or of removing obstacles if any existed before. But these two kinds of permission must be carefully distinguished in Hindustani. The former is expressed in Hindi by "anumati denā," and in Urdu by "ijāzat denī;" the latter (only) by that use of "denā" alone, which we are now discussing. *E.gr.* to say that God "Shaitān ko burāī karne kī ijāzat detā hai" would be blasphemy; but to say that He "Shaitān ko burāī karne detā hai" is an obvious fact, and simply amounts to saying that He "Shaitān ko burāī karne se nahīñ roktā," "He does not hinder Satan from doing evil." In this sense, one might turn the sentence, and say "Shaitān burāī karne pātā hai,' "Satan is allowed to do evil," *i.e.* he is not hindered from doing it.

9. It is often difficult for a foreigner to decide when to use "pānā" with the infinitive, and when "saknā" with the root, of another verb. In general, it may be said that "saknā" refers to the *power*, bodily or mental, of the agent himself, and "pānā" to his getting an *opportunity*, by the removal of obstacles, to do what he wishes. Yet this rule does not always apply; *e.gr.* if children, or servants, or subjects are not allowed to go into a certain place, or beyond a certain boundary, they say "ham wahāñ nahīñ jā sakte," not "wahāñ jāne nahīñ pāte." Again, we can say of the soldiers guarding our Lord's tomb that, knowing that sleeping on their watch meant death to them, they "na so *sakte* the." There was, of course, no physical hindrance to their sleeping; yet every motive *induced* them, and that strongly, to keep

"Pānā" and "Saknā"

awake. So that here, again, no hard and fast rule can be laid down; the foreigner must be content to learn gradually, through contact with native Indians.

Section 12—The Verb "Mārnā."

Different Constructions

1. In its secondary, but most usual, meaning, *viz.* that of striking or beating, this verb is construed in two ways. One of them corresponds with the English, *i.e.* the object struck is the object of the verb, *e.gr.* "us ne mujh ko mārā," "he hit me." In the other construction the object of the verb is the *instrument or mode* of striking or beating; *e.gr.* "us ne Patras kī paslī par hāth mārkar use jagāyā," "he woke Peter by striking his side with his hand," lit. "by striking his hand on his side;" "kisī Romī ādmī ke koṛe mārnā," "to whip a Roman man," lit. "to strike whips on a Roman;" "us ke muñh par tamāncha māro," "give him a box on the ear," lit. "strike a box on his face;" "us ne chaddar pakaṛkar jal par mārī," "he took hold of the sheet and smote the water with it."

2. The above examples show (1) that the member of the body, or other object, struck has the postposition "par" attached to it. (2) that when the instrument or means is expressed, the person struck has the adjectival affix "kā" ("ke," "kī") attached. Doubtless "ādmī ke koṛe mārnā" is put for "ādmī *ke badan par* koṛe mārnā;" in other words, "ke" does not really belong to "koṛe," though it looks as if it did. See Chapter IV, section 6.

3. "Mārnā" is also used idiomatically of other

actions, where it is difficult to see any connection with striking; *e.gr.* "shekhī mārnā," "to boast," "to brag;" "ṭhaṭṭhā mārnā," "to mock."

Idiomatic use

Section 13—The Verbs "Jānnā" and "Samajhnā."

1. "Jānnā" is derived from a Sanskrit root which means "to know," and indeed is cognate with the English "know;" but in Hindustani it has also acquired the weaker meaning of "to think," "to suppose," "to opine." In other words, what "jānnā" expresses is *consciousness* of a thing, whether the latter be true or false. *E.gr.* "kyā tum ḍākū jānkar talwāreñ aur lāṭhiyāñ lekar mere pakaṛne ko nikle ho?" "do you consider me a robber that you have come out" (lit. "are you come out having considered me a robber") "with swords and staves to arrest me?" Often, indeed, there is no fear of ambiguity; and *then* "jānnā" can be used for "to know" without scruple. *E.gr.* if a person tells us a thing which we know very well, we say "hāñ, maiñ bhī yih jāntā hūñ," "yes, I too know that." But where there is the least fear of ambiguity, it is best to adopt one of two expedients to show that we mean "to know," and not "to think;" *viz.* (1) to compound "jānnā" with either "lenā" or "jānā." *E.gr.* "maiñ ne jān liyā" and "maiñ jān gayā" both means "I have come to *know*" (not merely "to think"); but the latter is rather used when the coming to know is the result of long effort; (2) to substitute for "jānnā" one or other of the two words of Arabic origin, "maʿlūm" (lit. "known") and "ḵẖabar" (lit. tidings). "Maʿlūm nahīñ" and "ḵẖabar nahīñ" both mean "I don't

Stronger and Weaker Meanings

know," without any ambiguity. But in the case of "maʿlūm," this is the case only when it is joined to the substantive verb, either expressed (*e.gr* "maʿlūm hai," "it is known"), or implied in "nahīñ," as in the above example. When, however, "maʿlūm" is joined to the verb "honā," it receives the weak meaning of merely supposing. (See section 1, 12 of this chapter.)

2. "Samajhnā" has the same double meaning, a stronger and weaker; but while its weaker meaning is the same as that of "jānnā" (*e.gr.* "hāñ, pahle to maiñ ne use bhalā mānush samjhā thā," "yes, at first indeed I did think him an honest fellow"), its stronger is stronger than that of "jānnā," *viz.* to "understand." Often it is only the context which can decide between these two meanings of "samajhnā;" but the addition of "lenā" and "jānā" will always, in this case also, ensure the stronger meaning.

Ditto of "Samajhnā"

3. Two other things are worth noticing about the use of "samajhnā." When a person is speaking to us in too low a voice, or for any other cause we cannot catch his meaning, we say "I do not hear," or "I cannot hear;" when we *do hear* a sound coming from his mouth, but cannot *understand* what it signifies. In all such cases, Hindustanis, more accurately than we, use not "sunnā" but "samajhnā." But again, whereas we put the verb "to hear" in the present tense, they put it in the perfect. Where we ask "Do you hear?", they say *not* "kyā tum sunte ho?", or even "kyā tum samajhte ho?", but "kyā tum ne samjhā hai?", or better still, "kyā tum samjhe ho?"

Literal use

4. In the weaker meaning of both "jānnā" and "samajhnā," foreigners should take note of the fact that, while (*e.gr.*) "I think so-and-so" *may* be translated literally ("Maiñ samajhtā hūñ ki"), yet it is much more idiomatic to say "Merī samajh meñ," or some equivalent phrase; *e.gr.* "merī samajh meñ Angrez Jarmanoñ se ziyāda rahm-dil haiñ," "I think the English are more merciful than the Germans." Hence Indians, who speak English without being quite familiar with it, generally say "in my opinion" in such cases.

Section 14.—The Verb "Rahnā."

1. This means, of course, "to remain;" but when stress is intended to be placed on a person or a thing remaining unaltered, "banā rahnā" is preferred. (See section 7, 5 of this chapter).

2. Very often we use the substantive verb ("to be"), where the real meaning is "to remain;" and in all such cases Hindustanis use "rahnā." *E.gr.* "Certainly I will be with thee," if it means (as it does) that God *was* with Moses when He said this and would *still* be with him when he went to Egypt, is not "Nishchay maiñ tere sāth hūngā," but "rahūngā." So, "come to me to-day, I will not *be* here to-morrow" is "mere pās āj hī ānā; kal maiñ yahāñ na *rahūngā*." Again, the mocking question "where is now thy God?" is not correctly rendered by "terā Khudā ab kahāñ hai?" but by "terā Khudā ab kahañ rahā?" because the meaning is that His existence *was* supposed to be evident before, but now is no more evident. Again, the first line of a well-known and beautiful Urdu hymn, "Marne tak ho īmāndār," "Be faithful till death," is wrong; it should be "marne tak

= "To be"

rah īmāndār," because (1) it is impossible to use "honā," which properly means "to become," with a *duration* of time; and (2) even if this were possible, still the person addressed is supposed to *be* faithful at the time when he or she is addressed. Again, in John 2: 3 our Lord's mother says to Him, "they *have* no wine." But, seeing that they had had it before, and what she meant was that there was none *left*, the Urdu is "un ke pās mai nahīñ *rahī*."

"Rahnā" and "Honā"

3. Often it is difficult to decide between the use of "honā" and "rahnā;" and often while the West prefers "honā," the East, more accurately, prefers "rahnā." *E.gr.* "where there is life, there is strength" might be rendered "jahāñ zindagī hotī hai, wahāñ zor bhī hotā hai;" but it is better, specially in the East, to say "jahāñ zindagī rahtī hai, wahāñ zor bhī rahtā hai." Again, "this is just the work which ministers have to do" might be translated, "Pādrīoñ kā to yihī kām hotā hai;" but the East, at least, prefers "Pādrīoñ kā to yihī kām rahtā hai." Again, the expression, which occurs frequently in the ritual part of the Law, in the injunction, that the fat shall be taken off the animal and burnt on the altar, "jis charbī se antaṛiyāñ ḍhapī rahtī haiñ, and jo charbī un meñ liptī rahtī hai," "the fat wherewith the intestines are covered, and the fat which cleaves to them," is correct; for "ḍhapī hotī" and "liptī hotī" are not idiomatic, and "ḍhaptī haiñ" and "liptī hai," which are good Hindustani, would mean that the fat was *in the process* of covering, and cleaving to, the intestines; whereas the meaning is that when the animal is killed, the fat *is found* in those conditions and places. Again, "do ānkheñ *hote hue*," in Matt. 18: 9, is right in the West for "having two eyes;" but in the East it is, more correctly, "do ānkheñ *rahte hue*."

4. When a past time, terminating with the present, is spoken of, the West inserts "rahnā," but the East omits it. *E.gr.* "Ever since I came here, I *have been* unwell" is, in the West, "jab se maiñ yahāñ āyā, maiñ bīmār *rahā* hūñ," but in the East simply "jab se maiñ yahāñ āyā, tab se maiñ bīmār hūñ." Hence natives of the Eastern part of Hindustan, who do not know English well, would say in English "ever since I came here, I *am* unwell." (See more in Chapter XV, section 7, 3.)

East and West

Section 15.—The Verb "Rakhnā."

1. The original meaning of this verb is "to keep" (hence "rakhwāl," "a keeper"). And this original meaning is never wholly absent from it, though often it has to be translated by other English verbs.

Radical Meaning

2. It is often difficult for a foreigner to know by what Hindustani verb to translate "to put" or "to place;" and most Europeans use "rakhnā" in this sense even where Hindustanis use another verb; indeed, they think that "to put" is the proper meaning of "rakhnā." But this is not so; "rakhnā" is right for "to put," when by the latter we mean to put a thing in a place *with the object of its staying there;* but not otherwise. *E.gr.* "God *put* Adam in the garden of Eden" is "Khudā ne Ādam ko bāgh i ʿAdan meñ rakkhā," because he was meant to stay there; "put up thy sword into its sheath" is "apnī talwār miyān meñ rakh," because it was meant to stay there. On

"To Put"

the other hand, where the contact of the thing with the place where it is put is but temporary, or at least *meant* to be so, "rakhnā" is wrong and "lagānā" is right. *E.gr.* when "dinner things" are put on the table for a meal, "lagānā," not "rakhnā," should be said; and so far is this the case, that as we have the expression "lay the table," meaning "lay the things *on* the table," so Hindustanis say "mez lagāo" for "mez par bartan lagāo." But in the case of "putting" liquids, or anything (*e.gr.* grain) which can be poured into a vessel, both "rakhnā" and "lagānā" are wrong, and only "ḍālnā" can be idiomatically used.

"Rakhnā" and "Karnā"

3. "Rakhnā" and "karnā" are both used in connexion with many nouns; but the difference is, that "karnā" is said of a *momentary act*, while "rakhnā" implies a *continued state*. *E.gr.* "yād karnā" is "to recollect," *i.e.* to bring a person or thing into one's mind, but "yād rakhnā" is "to remember," *i.e.* to keep in memory; "prem" or "mahabbat karnā" is to set one's affection on a person, but "prem" or "mahabbat rakhnā" is "to love" in the sense of retaining and maintaining an affection for him. This distinction is even more important in expressions for faith, though here, while in Hindi "karnā" is used for the first exercise of faith, in Urdu "lānā" or "le ānā" is used in the same sense; but in the sense of continuing to believe, "rakhnā" is used in both. *E.gr.* in the opening words of the Creed, "I believe in God," while "maiñ Parameshwar," or "Khudā, par īmān lātā hūñ" or "vishwās kartā hūñ" would be all right for an atheist on coming to believe in God, yet such a sentence is quite wrong if uttered by a believer. In this case it can only be "Maiñ Parameshwar," or "Khudā, par īmān," or "vishwās, *rakhtā* hūñ."

4. Though "rahnā" and "rakhnā" have quite different origins (indeed, the Sanskrit root "rah" signifies only deprivation), yet *practically* one might almost say that "rakhnā" is the causal of "rahnā;" for wherever it is rightly used, it more or less clearly indicates *continuance*, "*letting remain.*" There are four verbs closely related to each other, though of quite different origins, *viz.* "honā," "karnā," "rahnā," and "rakhnā;" and one may say that as "honā" is to "karnā," so is "rahnā" to "rakhnā;" or, what comes to the same thing, as "honā" is to "rahnā," so is "karnā" to "rakhnā."

"Rakhnā" and "Rahnā"

5. We have said above (section 5 of this chapter) that when a person or thing *gets* a name, without any deliberate *naming* of him or it, "paṛnā" is used. But where there is such deliberate naming, "rakhnā" is the right verb; not "denā," which English people are so apt to say, because in English we "give" a name. *E.gr.* "thou shalt call His name Jesus" is "tū us kā nām Yeshū' *rakhnā.*"

In naming

Section 16—The Verb "Ṭhahrnā."

"Ṭhahrnā" is one of many Hindustani words which are derived from the Sanskrit root "sthā," "to stand," by changing the dental t into the palatal ṭ. And this meaning underlies all the ramifications of meaning which this Hindustani verb bears.

Radical Meaning

1. It means "to stop," "to come to a standstill," of a person or thing that is moving, *e.gr.* "ṭhahro,"

"stop" (addressed to an inferior who is moving), "ṭhahriye" (addressed to an equal or superior whom one wishes to pause in his speech);

"To Stop"

"He Sūrya, tū Gibon par, aur he Chandramā, tū Ayyālon kī tarāī ke ūpar ṭhahrā rah," "O Sun, stop thou over Gibeon, and O Moon, over the valley of Ayyālon." Here there is no stress on a standing posture; for the person addressed may stop and sit down, or he may be sitting all the while. But "ṭhahrnā" will not always do as a translation of "to stop;" *e.gr.* "when the rain stops" is not "jab bārish ṭhahregī," but "thamegī," or "band hogī."

2. It means "to stand forth," or appear, in a certain light; to be accounted or decided to have a certain character; to be treated as being so-and-so; and "ṭhahrānā," of course, is the causal of all these meanings. *E.gr.* "kewal rājgaddī ke vishay meñ maiñ tujh se baṛā ṭhahrūngā," "only in the matter of the throne will I be accounted greater than thou." The distinction between "ṭhahrnā" and "ṭhahrānā" on the one hand, and "honā," or "ho jānā," and "kar denā" on the other, is of great theological importance. When God says in Lev. 10:3 "I will be sanctified in them that come nigh Me," or in Ezek. 36:23 "I will sanctify My great name," the use of "honā" or "ho jānā" in the first text, and of "kar denā" in the second, would imply that God, and His name, were not already, and of necessity, holy; but the use of "ṭhahrnā" and "ṭhahrānā," respectively in the two places implies that though He Himself *is* holy, yet He is not always *treated* as such by His creatures. Again, "dharmī" (in Hindi), and "rāstbāz" (in Urdu), "ṭhahrnā" is what we call "justification," *i.e.* the fact that a believer is *counted*, and *treated as*, righteous by God, and that in this there are no degrees and no progress, for it is perfect from

"To Appear"

the first; but the use of "honā" or "ho jānā" with the above adjectives expresses what we call "sanctification," *i.e.* the gradual elimination of sin, and the person becoming *actually* righteous. Thus Hindustani has an advantage over Hebrew, Greek, and Latin; for in all these languages the word for "to justify" *literally* means "to *make* righteous," and it is only the context which shows, in many cases, that the meaning cannot be actually to make, but must be to reckon, and treat as, righteous. But in Hindustani, if the right words are used, no ambiguity is possible.

"To be settled"

3. It means "to be settled," "to be decided," of a matter which has been, or may have been, under discussion or consideration before. *E.gr.* if one wants to know the result of a trial in court, or of a committee's discussion of a subject, he asks "kyā ṭhahrā?" So the early Christians said that the enemies of Christ were gathered together "tāki jo kuchh pahle se terī qudrat and terī maslahat se ṭhahr gayā thā wuhī ʿamal meñ lāeñ," "in order that they might bring to pass just that which by Thy predestination and Thy counsel had previously been determined."

"To be proved"

4. "Ṭhahrnā" means "to be proved" by argument, and "to prove" (in the intransitive sense) by computation, or experience. *E.gr.* "ab maiñ ne yih ṭhahrā diyā hai, ki," "now I have proved, that;" "we ginne se pānch sau tīs ṭhahre," "they were numbered and proved to be 530." (In this sense "nikalnā" is also used; "we 530 nikle" would be just as good as the above.) "Maiñ ne is bāt kā tajruba kiyā hai, and yih aisī yā waisī ṭhahrī," "I have proved this matter by experience, and it has proved to be so-or-so."

5. It means "to last;" *e.gr.* "āj kal dūdh nahīñ ṭhahrtā," "now-a-days milk does not keep;" "yadi tū yih upāy kare to tū ṭhahr sakegā," "if thou adopt this expedient, thou wilt be able to last out."

"To Last"

Section 17—The Verb "Dekhnā."

1. Sight being considered the principal of the five senses, it is in Hindustani, as in English, applied to mental perceptions, though these may come through another sense, not through sight. *E.gr.* "Jab Bilām ne *dekhā* ki Yahowā Isrāel ko āshīsh hī dilānā chāhtā hai," "when Balaam *saw* that Jehovah wished only to bless Israel".

Metaphorical Use

2. The habit is almost universal among Europeans in India, and those Indians who imitate their speech, to call a person's attention, when about to address him, by exclaiming "dekho!" and then saying what they want to say to him. But this is *unidiomatic.* The way to call a person's attention, when he seems inattentive, or one is afraid that he will be inattentive, is to exclaim "suno;" which, surely, is what one means. Otherwise, if the person is not near, or is engaged in other work, and one wants him to stop that work, or to look towards oneself, so as to listen to what one is about to say, the way is to call him by some designation in the vocative case, which he will apply to himself; *e.gr.* "he jānewāle," "he lāl ṭopīwāle," "he mahārāj" (to a Brahman), "ai Sāhib" (to any respectable person). But Indians *do* introduce some of their sentences with "dekho" or "dekhiye," only with a different meaning to that with which Anglo-Indians do

"Dekho"

so. They say these words, not to call attention to *the fact that they are going to speak*, but to bespeak special attention to *what they are going to say*. Hence their use of these words corresponds to our beginning a sentence with "Mark my words," "just think," etc. *E.gr.* Judah says to Joseph, "Dekh, maiñ apne pitā ke yahāñ is larke kā jāmin huā hūñ," "consider" (the fact that), "I have become surety with my father for this lad."

"Behold"

3. In accordance with a Hebrew idiom, "behold" occurs very frequently indeed in the English Bible, and in most cases where we, in ordinary English, would use no word at all. In all such cases it should be omitted in Hindustani; for its use is even less idiomatic than in English. But there are other cases, in which sight is really referred to; and then "kyā dekhā," or "kyā dekhte haiñ," etc., followed by "ki," is good Hindustani. *E.gr.* "Aisā karke we roṭī khāne ko baiṭh gaye, aur jo ānkheñ uṭhāīñ to kyā dekhā ki," "Having done this they sat down to eat bread; and when they lifted up their eyes, behold," etc. (See also Chap. XL, 1).

"To Read"

4. "Dekhnā" is often used where we say "to read." The difference between "dekhnā" in this sense, and "paṛhnā," is that "dekhnā" is used of quiet reading by oneself, and "paṛhnā" always implies reading *aloud*. In fact, so essential is this condition to the use of "paṛhnā," that it is said when there is no book, etc., before the eyes at all, and the "paṛhnewālā" merely recites from memory. But *most* of the reading which is done in these days, not indeed at school but after leaving school, is "dekhnā," not "paṛhnā." *E.gr.* one might say to a Musalman in English, "Have

you ever read the Gospel?", and the Hindustani of this is "Āp ne kyā kabhī Injīl sharīf ko dekhā hai?"

5. We have already (section 5, 3 of this chapter) spoken of the difference between "dekhnā" and "dekh paṛnā;" and similarly between "sunnā" and "sun paṛnā."

6. In English we speak of eyes seeing, and ears hearing; but this is not idiomatic in Hindustani. Either omit the eyes and ears, and simply say "see" or "hear;" or, if stress is meant to fall on the person seeing or hearing, say "apnī ānkhoñ se dekhnā" or "apne kānoñ se sunnā."

Section 18—The Verbs "Saknā" and "Chuknā."

1. These verbs are alike, in that while sometimes used alone, yet in the great majority of cases they follow a verb in the *bare root* form. Thus, like "jānā," they form what *might* be called "compound verbs," but for the fact that they never lose their proper meaning, as "jānā" loses its own meaning. There is a very bad idiom, affected by those Europeans who speak Hindustani badly, according to which the infinitive in the modified form is used with "saknā;" *e.gr.* "ham yih kahne nahīñ sakte," "I cannot say this." This *may* once have been good Hindustani; but now, at any rate, it betokens a *low* origin, or environment, in the speaker.

Similarity

2. We have already (section 11, 9 of this chapter) spoken of "saknā" in relation to "pānā." All that

remains to be said about it is that it must be repeated in a sentence, when it belongs to different verbs; because the verb in the bare root form cannot stand alone. *E.gr.* "he can neither eat bread nor drink water in my house," "wuh mere ghar meñ na to roṭī khā saktā, na pānī pī saktā hai." Here, it would not do to say "na to roṭī khā, na pānī pī saktā hai;" though the "hai" should not be repeated (see Chap. XV; 3, 9), yet the "saktā" must be. True, if the former verb be in the infinitive, as it is with "chāhnā" and other verbs, it is *not* idiomatic to repeat it. *E.gr.* if the above sentence had been "he wishes neither to eat bread nor to drink water in my house," the Hindustani for it would have been "wuh mere ghar na to roṭī khāne, na pānī pīne, chāhtā hai." But it is the awkwardness of a verb in the bare root form standing alone, which makes this rule about "saknā;" and the same applies to "chuknā," and indeed any verb which requires the preceding verb to be put in the bare root form.

Must be Repeated

1. "Chuknā," by itself, means "to come to an end." *E.gr.* "us ke phirte phirte thailī kā jal chuk gayā," "as she wandered about, the water in the flask was used up." So the causal "chukānā" is used of *settling* a law-suit. But "chuknā" is commonly used along with another verb; and then, though sometimes the idea of finishing is plain enough, *e.gr.* "maiñ khā chukā," "I have done eating," *i.e.* "I have had enough," yet generally it can be best put into English by the use of the adverb "already." *E.gr.* "yadi ham log vilamb na karte to ab loñ dūsrī bār bhī lauṭke ā chukte," "if we had not delayed, we should by this time have already returned even the second time;" "maiñ tum ko yih hukm kaī bār de chukā hūñ," "I have

"Chuknā"

already given you this order several times." Perhaps the clearest rule, as to when to use "chuknā" and when not, is this. If what is spoken of be the completion of a work or state *itself*, then "chuknā" is wrong; but if the point of view is a time *after* that completion, and one looks back on it as it were, then it is right. *E.gr.* "he finished his work (in a narrative)" is not "wuh apnā kām kar chukā," but "us ne apnā kām nipaṭā diyā," or "tamām kiyā" (in Urdu); but "he *has* finished his work" is "wuh apnā kām kar chukā hai," and "he had finished his work" is "wuh apnā kām kar chukā thā." There could not be a better rendering of the cry "It is finished" from the Cross, than "Ho chukā." The interval may be only a moment; *e.gr.* one dictating a lesson might say "jab jab maiñ bol chukūñ, to tum log likhnā," "whenever I have done speaking then you write."

Section 19.—The Verbs "Uṭhnā" and "Baiṭhnā."

"Uṭhnā"

1. "Uṭhnā" is attached to another verb (forming with it a compound verb) to express sudden or unexpected action; *e.gr.* "wuh bol uṭhe," "they spoke up," or "exclaimed." Also, when compounded with "jānā" (forming the *first* member of a compound verb with it), it has the special meaning of going right away. *E.gr.* if one goes to a house, expecting to find there some one who formerly lived in it, and, finding the house either locked up, or occupied by others, inquires of the neighbours what has become of one's friend, they will say "wuh uṭh gayā." They would *not* say this if he had only gone out for a time, intending to return; but only if he had left the place "for good." Again "uṭhānā" means not only "to raise" or "to lift up," but also "to take away." *E.gr.* "take away the tea-things" is "chā ke bartan uṭhāo," *not* "le jāo," as a foreigner, un-

acquainted with the idiom, would say. And it is the regular word used for "picking and stealing." *E.gr.* "khabardār, koī in chīzoñ meñ se kisī ko uṭhāne na pāe,' "take care, don't let anyone run off with any of these things." Further, "uṭhnā" is idiomatically used where a foreigner naturally uses "charhnā," because he is accustomed to use "to mount up" in his own language. *E.gr.* "the smoke mounted up to the sky" is "dhūwāñ āsmān tak uṭhā," not "charhā." So of Christ's ascension we may say "Khudā ne use āsmān par uṭhāyā," not "charhāyā." (See the next section).

"Baiṭhnā"

2. "Baiṭhnā," when the second member of a compound verb, imparts to the action a sort of "coolness;" *e.gr.* "wuh mujh ko mār baiṭhā," "he coolly beat me," or "beat me and thought nothing of it;" "wuh rājā ban baiṭhā," "he coolly posed as a king," as if it was a matter of indifference; "wuh apne pahile gunāhoñ ke dhoe jāne ko bhūle baiṭhā hai," "he has forgotten" (and is indifferent to) "having been washed from his former sins." Also "baiṭhnā" is used in other ways, where we should never think of speaking of "sitting;" *e.gr.* when a person has partially lost his voice, Hindustanis say "us kā galā baiṭh gayā;" and when the dust "is laid" by rain, they say "garda baiṭh gayā;" and they express the setting of the sun not only by "ḍūbnā," but also by baiṭhnā." And "baiṭhnā" is regularly used in the sense of "unemployment;" *e.gr.* "wuh baiṭhā hai" means "he is out of work."

Section 20.—The Verbs "Charhnā" and "Utarnā."

1. 'Charhnā" means "to ascend," *i.e.* to go from where one is to a higher place; and "utarnā" means to

come down from a higher place to a lower one. But there must be something *continuous between* the two places. Hence these verbs are regularly used of ascending and descending hills, stairs, mounting horses, etc.; and of "getting into" and "getting out of" carriages, boats, etc., even though, as often happens in the case of a boat, its bottom is *lower* than the shore from which one steps into it. But where there is a wide interval between the places, these verbs are not used. *E.gr.* it is *not* idiomatic (though so found in the Creed) to say "wuh āsmān par charḥ gayā" of Christ's ascension, because that suggests stairs, or something of the sort, *by* which He ascended. "Āsmān par gayā" conveys the meaning clearly enough. "Charḥnā" is used *not* of the sun, etc. rising above the horizon, but of its rising *higher* in the sky; hence the expression "ek pahar din charḥe," "when the day was three hours old," lit. "the day having ascended by one watch." "Charḥānā" is the regular verb for "offering" a sacrifice, and "charḥnā" for its being offered; because the altar, on which it is put, is supposed to be higher then the feet of the offerers.

"Charḥnā"

2. In the Bible, *i.e.* in Hebrew and Greek idiom, "going up" and "going down" are constantly used of various degrees of altitude above or below sea-level. Thus, travellers from Palestine "go *down*" to Egypt; and God brought Israel "*up*" from Egypt; and our Lord "went down" from Cana of Galilee to Capernaum; and so on. But in Hindustani, "charḥnā" and "utarnā" are used in these senses *only when the goal is in sight* (as from Rajpur to Mussoorie); *otherwise* the simple "jānā" and "ānā" must be employed.

Not Geographical

3. "Charḥnā" and "utarnā" are the regular words for fever "coming on" and "leaving" a person. *E.gr.* "Mujhe sakẖt tap charḥī hai," "I have got bad fever on me;" "us kā bukẖār kal utar gayā," "his fever left him yesterday." Also for spirits "possessing," and "leaving" or "being expelled from," a person. It is true that, in deference to New Testament thought, "nikālnā" is most often used in the Gospels for "casting out" demons; but the idiomatic Hindustani is "utārnā." "Utārnā" is also the regular word for "taking off" one's clothes, opposite to "pahinnā," to "put on" clothes. "Apnī urdī utāro" means "take off your uniform." "Utārnā" is also used for "copying." *E.gr.* "Yah vākya Yashāyāh kī pustak se utārā gayā," "this sentence is an extract," or "is quoted, from the book of Isaiah." "Utarnā" is also said of "putting up" at a house, because commonly the traveller *gets down* from his carriage to do so; and so "to put up" a friend or a guest in one's house is called "utārnā." *E.gr.* "Us ne mujhe bare prem se utār liyā," "he received me into his house with great affection."

Various uses

4. It should perhaps be observed here that there are two distinct verbs "utarnā." Both are derived from Sanskrit verbs; in both the root is the same, "tar;" but in Sanskrit the one prefixes the preposition "ava," the other "ut," to the root. Hence "avatar" means "to go or come *down*" (hence "avatār," "descent"), and "uttar" means "to go or come *across*." In this section we deal only with the former; but learners should avoid confusing this with the other "utarnā," *e.gr.* "nāw par charḥke utar jānā," "to cross over by boat."

Two Verbs "Utarnā"

Section 21—The Verb "Baṛhnā" and "Ghaṭnā."

1. "Baṛhnā" means "to increase" (instransitive), and "ghaṭnā" means "to decrease;" and *that* not only in material size (like the "growth" of a child or a plant, or the diminution of one's money in the bank), but also in circumstances, as *e.gr.* in importance in the world, etc., etc. But each of these verbs has also *another* meaning.

"To Increase"

2. "Baṛhnā" means, besides "to increase," "to advance," "to go on." *E.gr.* "us se āge baṛho," "get on beyond," or "in advance of, him." And this is applied not only to literal advance, but also to all kinds of progress. Thus, in writing a book, or giving an address, one may say "Ham āge baṛhkar is bāt kā mufassil bayān karenge," "further on we will treat fully of this matter." So one may say "Mūsā ne hatyā ko barjā thā, par Masīh is se baṛhke krodh ko bhī barajtā hai," "Moses forbade murder, but Christ goes beyond this. and forbids anger." The causal "baṛhānā," too, is similarly used; *e.gr.* "Yeshū ne apne āp ko kewal Masīh hī nahīñ, par is se baṛhāke Parameshwar kā Putra bhī kahā," "Jesus did not only call Himself the Christ, but went beyond this and called Himself the Son of God." Here the transitive "baṛhānā" implies some object, like "his own word," understood. "Baṛhānā," in the sense of "adding," takes the postposition "meñ" with the thing added *to; e.gr.* "us ke vachanoñ meñ na baṛhā," "add not to His words."

"To Advance"

3. "Ghaṭnā" is more used in Hindi than in Urdu. And in Hindi it has another meaning also, *viz.* "to apply" (intransitive). Really, these are two distinct

verbs, though they happen to have the same form. This second "ghaṭnā," and its causal "ghaṭānā," correspond with the Urdu "sādiq ānā" and "sādiq lānā." *E.gr.* yah upadesh mujh par ṭhīk ghaṭtā hai," "this exhortation applies exactly to me;" "Paul ne Masīh kā wah vachan apne samay ke logoñ par ghaṭāyā," "Paul applied that word of Christ to his contemporaries."

"**Ghaṭnā**"

4. For the adjectival meaning of the conjunctive participle of these verbs, (see Chap. XV, section 14, 12).

Section 22.—The Verbs "Ṭūṭnā," "Phūṭnā," and "Phaṭnā."

These verbs, with their irregular causals (*viz.* "toṛnā," "phoṛnā," and "phāṛnā"), mean severally "to break," "to burst," and "to tear." But their use does not *exactly* correspond with that of these English verbs. *E.gr.* we speak of "breaking a jar," but Hindustanis say "gharā phūṭ gayā;" we speak of "plucking," or "picking," or "gathering, a flower or fruit," but they always use "toṛnā" in the sense; we speak of blinding a person with a sharp instrument, which they express by "ānkheñ phoṛnā;" we say a man has been "mauled" by a wild beast, whereas they say "wuh kisī banpashu se phāṛā gayā;" we speak of a hope being "lost," but they say "ummed ṭūṭ gaī" (the regular expression for "disappointment").

Section 23—Some other Hindustani Verbs.

1. "Ḍhālnā" is used in the East of Hindustan in the sense of "to pour," whatever be the nature of the

thing poured. But in the West it is used only of melting metals; and because metals, when melted, are poured into a vessel, and when cool assume the shape of the vessel, "ḍhālnā" also means "to mould," or "shape," a thing. "Ḍhālī huī mūrat" is "a molten image." Yet, that the meaning of this verb which obtains in the East is probably the original one seems proved by the fact that the intransitive "ḍhalnā" means "to fade away," used of the day at evening, as if the day was being gradually poured out. "Din ḍhal chalā," "it is toward evening," might well be said at 4 P.M.

"**Ḍhālnā**"

2. "Nikalnā," besides its proper meaning of "coming" or "going *out*," is also used of going *beyond*. "Dekho, wuh baṛī dūr nikal gaī," "Look, she has gone on very far," may be said of some one whom one is trying to catch up. And "nikālnā," the causal of "nikalnā," besides its proper meaning of "taking" or "putting out," is also used for "discovering;" specially of any new scientific invention. *E.gr.* "jab se bārūd nikālā gayā," "ever since gunpowder was invented." See also section 16, 4 of this chapter.

"**Nikalnā**"

3. "Kaṭnā" and "kāṭnā," "to be cut" and "to cut," are used in senses which we should never express by the figure of "cutting." "Jāṛā kāṭnā" is "to spend the winter;" though this word is *more* used when the spending of time is accompanied with suffering, and the time is with difficulty passed through. "Maiñ ne rāt ko bare mushkil se kāṭā," "I have with great difficulty got through the night," might be said by a great sufferer. Also these verbs are used in the sense of "to erase" from any writing, specially an

"**Kaṭnā**"

account; and hence "pāp kaṭnā" is used by Hindus of what we call "being forgiven." "Punya karne se pāp kaṭ jātā hai," "By doing works of merit sin is forgiven," *i.e.* "guilt is removed," is what Hindus say, and believe.

4. On the other hand, when the "cutting" is right through, not "kāṭnā" but "chīrnā" is used. Hence Indians speak of a surgical operation as "chīrnā," because it involves cutting through the skin.

"To Believe" and "To Love"

5. We have already (section 15, 3) shewn the difference between "īmān lānā" (or "vishwās karnā") and "īmān" or "vishwās rakhnā," though both are rendered in English by "to believe;" also between "prem" (or "mahabbat") "karnā" and "rakhnā," though "to love" is the English for both. It only remains to say here (1) that when "to believe" means only to accept a person's statement as true, apart from any trust in him personally, it is rendered by "us kā yaqīn karnā" in Urdu, and "us kī pratīti karnā" in Hindi. (2) That seeing that "Love," in its full sense, can only be felt *between persons*, because only they can reciprocate it; or, at least, it can be felt only *towards* a person, because only he is *capable* of reciprocating it, though at first he may not do so; therefore, whatever words are in Hindustani used for "to love" require the postposition "se," which is for "ke sāth." "Ko" *is* often used in this connexion, but wrongly, *i.e.* through want of consideration of what real love implies; and the particular phrase "kisī ko pyār karnā" is properly used *only* in the sense of "fondling," "caressing," *i.e.* employing outward demonstrations of affection, which may be shewn to an *animal* as well as to a person.

6. "Kām denā," preceded by "kā," means "to act as." *E.gr.* "jab kāgaz nahīñ miltā, tab per kā chhilkā us kā kām de saktā hai," "when one cannot get paper, the bark of trees is a good substitute," lit. "can act as it;" "Rūhu'lquds āg ke donoñ kām detā hai," "The Holy Spirit acts as fire in both ways." And "sāth denā" and "sang denā" mean to help, or assist, by oneself taking part of a task *with* another person.

"Kām Denā"
"Sāth Denā"

7. We use the verb "to hear" similarly, whether the object of hearing be a person or what he says; but Hindustanis more correctly use "kī" with the person, and "ko," or no postposition, with the words. "Hear me" is "Merī suno," not "mujhe suno;" but "hear my words" is "merā kalām suno." Probably "bāt" is understood after "kī;" hence the feminine gender. But this rule does not apply where the word for the person heard has a participle attached to it, signifying his speaking; *e.gr.* "ham ne is *ko* Mūsā aur Khudā ke barkhilāf kufr kī bāteñ karte sunā," "we heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and God."

"Sunnā"

8. "Bharnā" means "to fill;" and it is often construed as "to fill" is in English; *e.gr.* "is bartan ko pānī se bhar do," "fill this vessel with water." But it is rather more idiomatic to treat the substance, with which a thing is filled, as the direct object of "bharnā," and to attach "meñ" to the thing filled; *e.gr.* "is bartan *meñ pānī* bharo;" as we say "*put* water *into* this vessel."

"Bharnā"

9. "Urnā" means "to fly," and "uṛānā" "to send flying." But these Hindustani verbs are used in

many senses, where we never think of "flying." In fact, whatever passes through the air is said to "uṛ;" wings are not necessary for this; *e.gr.* smoke, clouds, scent, etc. And so, metaphorically, "uṛānā" means "to dissipate" money, health, and so on; hence "uṛāū" is a "prodigal."

Uṛnā

10. With "bhejnā," "to send," some causal verbs are connected in the bare form without terminations, making together a kind of compound verb; *e.gr.* "bulā bhejnā," "to send and call;" "kahlā bhejnā," "to send and say," *i.e.* to send *by* some one.

Bhejnā

11. In the passive voice of "to teach," and verbs of similar meaning, we make the person taught the subject, and the thing taught him the object. But the Hindustani idiom is the opposite. *E.gr.* "I was taught theology at home" is "*Mujhe* ʿilm-i-ilāhī ghar meñ sikhāyā gayā," not "maiñ ʿilm-i-ilāhī ghar meñ sikhāyā gayā." So with "samjhānā," dikhānā," "chitānā," etc. "Yih bāt mujhe pahile kabhī na sikhāī gaī thī," "I never had this explained to me before;" "āj mujhe nayā nazzāra dikhāyā gayā," "to-day I have been shewn a new sight."

Sikhānā, etc.

12. "Gāṛnā" means to put a thing *into* something else; either into the ground, or as a nail is *driven* into wood, etc., etc. And there is no need of the thing put being altogether hidden in the substance into which it is put; *e.gr.* it is used of a stick *stuck* into the ground, though the greater part is above ground. But, because we use "to bury" of a thing put altogether inside the ground, foreigners have

"To Bury"

largely come to use "gārnā" as equivalent to the "burial" of a person! This is most disrespectful; and besides, in the case, *e.gr.* of Christ, no part of whose corpse was put inside anything, but laid on a shelf at the side of a rock-hewn tomb, it is utterly false. The Urdu for burial of a dead person is "dafn karnā;" but "miṭṭī denā" is a word which, in Hindi and Urdu alike, covers all forms of disposal of the dead, including cremation. Only, if one has occasion to speak of a grave, or tomb of any kind, "qabr" is the word to use; for Hindus do not, as a rule, bury their dead.

13. "Hilnā," of course, means "to shake" (oneself); but it is also used of "getting used," "getting reconciled," to a new condition of things in which one finds oneself. Probably the connecting meaning is "shaking down," as we say.

Section 24.—The Verbs "to Have" and "to Use."

1. Neither of these English verbs has an equivalent in ordinary Hindustani. There is, indeed, the verb "baratnā," which means "to use;" but this is confined to the West of Hindustan, and even there is not common; though the noun "bartāw" is common in the sense of "usage of a person," *i.e.* treating him, whether well or ill. And boys in elementary schools in India are taught to translate "to have" by "rakhnā;" but this is only very seldom correct.

"Baratnā"

2. "To have" is expressed in Hindustani by "ke pās," or "ko," or simply "ke" (or the genitive of personal pronouns); in the last case "pās," or "ghar meñ,"

or "ʿilāqe meñ," or some similar word or phrase, being understood after "ke." As to *which* of these words or phrases to use in any given case, it is impossible to give a hard and fast rule; for the most part, it can be learnt only by intercourse with Indians, and noticing how they speak (and write). Yet, in general, it may be said that "ke pās" implies that the thing "had" is *close to* him who has it, or at least *in his possession;* so that a man may say "mere pās do laṛke haiñ," "I have two sons," even though they may be in another country. "Ko" is used in certain connexions, as *e.gr.* "us ko bhārī bīmārī huī" (or "lagī") "hai," "he has got a sore disease." The use of "ke" alone is not known in the extreme East of Hindustan. There, if a man wanted to say "I have five daughters," he would say "mere pās pānch laṛkiyāñ haiñ," or "merī pānch laṛkiyāñ haiñ;" but in other parts any one who heard this last sentence would suppose that some predicate, *e.gr.* "bīmār," had been omitted, and that the speaker meant "Five of my daughters are (ill)." This ambiguity is obviated by the use of "ke;" for "mere pānch laṛkiyāñ haiñ" can only mean "I have five daughters." As to the *verb* to be used in such sentences, it may be the substantive verb, or "honā," or "rahnā," according to the exact thought in the speaker's mind. Examples of "rahnā" are: "Wuh kitāb mere pās nahīñ rahtī," "I have not that book;" "mujhe itnī tāqat nahīñ rahtī ki aisā bhārī bojh uṭhāūñ," "I have not the strength sufficient to lift such a heavy weight."

"To have"

3. "To use" is expressed throughout Hindustan by "kām meñ lānā," or "le ānā," lit. "to bring into work," or (in Urdu) "istiʿmāl meñ lānā;" and "to be used" by "kām," or "istiʿmāl, meñ ānā." But commonly

"To use"

it is expressed, not by any single verb applicable to all cases, but by some verb suitable to the connexion, *E.gr.* "to use a pen" is "kalam se likhnā;" "to use a bedstead" is "chārpāī par sonā;" "to use a sword" is "talwār chalānā;" "to use a word" is "lafz" (or "shabd") "bolnā;" and so on. In short, one must first think *what kind* of use one wishes to express, and then use the appropriate Hindustani verb.

CHAPTER XVII.

ADVERBS.

What Adverbs are meant.

1. In this chapter we deal only with those adverbs or adverbial phrases, which are represented in English by words either similar in form to adjectives (*e.gr.* "well," "ill," "fast"), or formed from them by adding the affix "ly." Hindustani, also, in some cases uses adjectives in the sense of adverbs, without any addition or other change; *e.gr.* "bahut" means "very" as well as "much;" "us ne us ko achchhā mārā," "he gave him a good beating," lit. "he beat him well:" in the same sense, "us ne us ko khūb mārā;" and "jald" means "quickly" as well as "quick." And there is a use of "barā," unpardonable in literary or public language, but very common in conversation; *e.gr.* "wuh barā jaltā hai," "it burns very much."

2. But, with these few exceptions, Hindustani does not treat adjectives as adverbs, but forms the latter in two other ways. One way is to add to the adjective some noun signifying "manner," followed by "se" (or in some cases by "par"); *e.gr.* "achchhī rīti se,' "well" (lit. in a good manner"); "pūrī rīti se," "wholly" (lit. "in a whole manner"); "lāiq taur par" "worthily" (lit. "in a worthy manner"); "wājib tarah se,"* "rightly" (lit. in a right manner"). The other method is to use an abstract noun signifying the quality expressed by the adjective, followed by "se," and in some cases by "karke." *E.gr.* "jaldī se," "quickly" (lit. "with quickness"); "kasrat se," "abundantly" (lit. "with abundance"); "zor se," "forcibly" (lit. "with force"); "ḍhiṭhāī se," "impudently," (lit. "with impudence"); "sustī se," "lazily" (lit. "with laziness"); "mihnat karke," "diligently" (lit. "doing labour").

Two modes of formation

---

* "Se" is very often omitted after "tarah," but "par" is not omitted after "taur."

CHAPTER XVIII.

Certain Conjunctions.

Section 1.—"Aur."

1. "Aur" is not only a conjunction; it is also an adjective, meaning "more" or "other;" and when used in this sense, it should be, in the Persian and the Roman characters, distinguished from the conjunction by some recognized sign. It is *not* used where that, *than* which a thing is more or other, is expressed; in other words, where these words are *manifest* comparatives; but only where the comparative sense lies under the surface. *E.gr.* "mujhe âur roṭī do," "give me more bread" (*viz.* than I have already had); "maiñ âur na khāūñgā," "I will not eat more" (than I have eaten); "wahāñ âur bahut se ādmī milenge," "there you will find many other men;" "ek âur bādshāh hai," "there is another king." In this sense, it is often difficult for a foreigner to decide whether to use "âur" or "dūsrā;" and in some cases a native will use both indiscriminately; but generally he will distinguish their use; and the foreigner must try to learn from *him* which to use.

Original of "Aur"

2. The above was the original meaning of "aur," which is contracted from "avar," which is corrupted from the Sanskrit "apar," "other;" but in Hindustani

it commonly occurs as a conjunction; and of it in this sense we make the following remarks.

Omission of "Aur"

(1) When two words are joined together, either as contrasted couples, or as meaning the same thing though of various kinds—in this latter case the second word simply rhymes with the first—, then "aur" is omitted. Examples of the contrasted couples are: "Mā bāp," "parents" [lit. "mother-father."

N.B.—Here the mother is mentioned first, not from any greater respect paid to her, but solely because "mā bāp" *sounds* better than "bāp mā"]; "dukh sukh," "pleasure and pain" (here the order is opposite to that in English); "pāp pun" "merit and demerit" (here also the order is opposite); "bhalā burā," "good and evil" (but "bhalā burā kahnā" has acquired the special meaning of "speaking *evil*" to or of a person, the sense of "bhalā" being merged in that of "burā"); "thoṛā bahut," where the sense of "bahut" is almost, if not entirely, merged in that of "thoṛā." Examples of couples in which the second member is added to rhyme with the first, and imparts to it the meaning of variety in multiplicity, are: "laṛke bāle," "children" (this is a convenient form to use when a neighbour's children are of both sexes, or one does not know of which sex they are; "laṛke" alone would mean *only* "boys"); "jhagṛā ragṛā," "quarrels and disputes;" "ulṭā pulṭā," "upside-down," "all in confusion." In "bālbachche," which also means "children" in general, there is not rhyme, but assonance; both words begin with b.

Suppression of "Aur"

(2) When more than two words or clauses are *in sense* connected by "and," modern Hindustani has adopted the English custom of dropping the conjunction except before the *last* word or clause. Yet this is no invariable rule in

Hindustani, any more than it is in English; for sometimes emphasis, and sometimes perspicuity, require the insertion of "aur" in every place.

(3) Often Hindustanis say "aur," where we say "but." In other words, we perceive a contrast, where Hindustanis do not, but only a co-ordination of ideas. *E.gr.* "yih tadbīr yā kām agar ādmīoñ kī taraf se hai to āp barbād ho jāegā, *aur* agar Khudā kī taraf se hai," "if this scheme or work is of men, it will of itself come to naught; *but* if it is of God," etc.

Often = "But"

(4) "Aur" is used to introduce the consequence of a previous imperative being attended to. *E.gr.* "māngo, aur tumheñ milegā; ḍhūnḍho, aur tum pāoge; khaṭ-khaṭāo, aur tumhāre liye khol diyā jāegā." Here it would be just as good Hindustani to use no connecting word at all (*e.gr.* "māngo, tumheñ milegā"); and in Hindi, "tab" would be quite good here; but "aur," like the English "and," is the common idiom.

In Apodosis

Section 2.—"Lekin," "Par," "Magar," "Balki."

1. "But," in English, is not always an adversative conjunction (*i.e.* a conjunction implying something *contrary* to what has preceded). Sometimes it means "except;" in which case, in Urdu "siwā" or "ʿalāwa," and in Hindi "chhoṛ" or "chhoṛke," represent it. *E.gr.* "Āp ke bhāī ke siwā âur sab wahāñ the," "all but your brother were there;" "ek din chhoṛ maiñ lagātār wahāñ jātā thā," "I went there regularly, every

Different meanings of "But"

day but one." Sometimes it is inserted idiomatically in English, where it is not really necessary; *e.gr.* "I doubt not but that it is so." Here it is unrepresented in Hindustani; "Mujhe kuchh shakk nahīñ, ki hāl aisā hī hai." Sometimes it stands for the negative; *e.gr.* "No fear but he will come," *i.e.* "No fear that he will *not* come." Here, again, it is the plain meaning, not the English idiom, that is expressed in Hindustani; "Beshakk wuh āenge." But we are dealing in this section with the adversative conjunction "but;" which is in Hindi "parantu," or, very much more commonly, its abbreviated form "par;" and in Urdu "lekin" (for the Arabic "lākin") and "magar."

2. "Magar" and "lekin" are generally synonyms, and are often interchanged, so as to prevent the same word coming too often in a sentence. But besides this use of "magar," it is also used in the sense of "only," when this English word is an adversative conjunction. *E.gr.* "I wished very much to do that work, only I had no time for it" would be in Hindustani "Maiñ wuh kām karnā bahut hī chāhtā thā, magar us ke liye fursat na milī." Here "but" would be quite good in English; but the fact that "only" is just as good English shows that in Hindustani this is a case for "magar," not for "lekin." Another example is: "Us ne us ko kuchh mīrās na dii, magar waʿda kiyā ki," etc., "He gave him no inheritance, only he promised him," etc.

"Magar"

3. (1) "Balki," and in literary Hindi "baran," are very often translateable by "but;" yet their radical meaning is not adversative, but progressive; and even when "but" would be the best English word for them, there is the thought of

"Balki" Progressive

advance in their meaning, besides that of contrariety with the preceding. And often there is no thought of contrariety at all, *only* of advance. *E.gr.* "yih wuhī ādmī hai, jo har jagah sab ādmīoñ ko is maqām ke khilāf sikhātā hai, *balki* Yūnānīoñ ko bhī haikal meñ lākar is pāk maqām ko nāpāk kiyā hai," "this is the man, who everywhere teaches men against this place, *and even*" (or "*and in addition*") "has defiled this holy place by bringing Greeks into the temple;" "Misra kā rājā tum ko jāne na degā, *baran* bare bal se dabāye jāne par bhī jāne na degā," "the king of Egypt will not let you go; *not even* though pressed with great force will he let you go." These two examples further show that when "balki" or "baran" is used in this sense, they must be followed by "bhī." When the advance is to be emphasized, the word "kyā" is inserted before "balki" or "baran." *E.gr.* "Phiraun rāt hī ko uṭh baiṭhā, wahī kyā baran sab Misrī log bhī uṭh baiṭhe," "Pharaoh sat up in the night, and not only he" (lit. "and only he?") "but all the Egyptians also sat up;" "is se tū kyā baran ye log bhī nishchāy hār jāenge," "in this way not only thou" (lit. "thou?"), "but also these people, will certainly be exhausted." See Chap. XXV, 8.

Not always After Negative

(2) It is often said that "balki" is the word to use for "but," when this word follows a negative clause (like the German "sondern"); but this is a mistake. When the second clause *simply denies* the negative clause (*e.gr.* "I am not ill, but well"), neither "balki" nor "baran" is right. In such cases *either* "lekin," "par," etc., should be used, *or* no word at all; *e.gr.* the above English sentence might in Hindustani be *either* "Maiñ bīmār nahīñ, lekin tandurust hūñ," *or* "Maiñ bīmār nahīñ, tandurust hūñ." So "I shall not die, but live" is best rendered "Maiñ marūngā nahīñ, jītā rahūngā." On

the other hand, "I came not to cancel but to fulfil" is rightly rendered "Maiñ mansūkh karne nahīñ *balki* pūrā karne āyā hūñ;" because fulfilling is not merely not cancelling, but goes beyond it.

Section 3—"Phir."

The common meaning of this word is, of course, "again" (from the root of the verb "phirnā," "to turn" or "to return"); but besides this, it has some idiomatic meanings.

1. It often stands for "then," *not* in the sense of "at that time," but "in those conditions." *E.gr.* "pahile apnī ānkh meñ se to shahtīr nikāl, phir apne bhāī kī ānkh meñ se tinke ko achchhī tarah dekhkar nikāl sakegā," "first take the beam out of thine own eye, then" (*i.e.* not simply "after doing so," but "on the condition of having done so") "thou wilt be able to see clearly to take the mote out of thy brother's eye." "Israelī log to Arnon ke kināre ke sab nagaroñ meñ tīn sau baras se base haiñ, *phir* itne dinoñ meñ tum logoñ ne un ko kyoñ nahīñ chhurā liyā?", "The Israelites have been settled in all the cities along the Arnon for 300 years; *well, then*, why have you not rescued them in all this time?" "Tū mere dewatāoñ ko churā le gayā hai, *phir* mujh se kyoñ pūchhtā hai ki kyā huā?", "Thou hast stolen my gods, *so* why sayest thou to me What is the matter?"

Conditional

2. It follows from this that, when "bhī" is added to "phir," the two together mean "nevertheless," "not-

withstanding," "however;" whether or no a word for "although" has preceded. *E.gr.* "phir bhī ham kāmiloñ meñ hikmat kī bāteñ kahte haiñ," "nevertheless, we do speak words of wisdom among the perfect;" "agarchi is waqt us ko nahīñ dekhte, phir bhī khushī manāte ho," "though you now see Him not, *yet* you are joyful."

"Phir bhī"

3. "Phir" also stands for "then," not in the sense of "at that time," but of "*after* that time," *i.e.* "*next* after that time." *E.gr.* "maiñ apne hāth se tujhe ḍhāmpe rahūngā *phir* apnā hāth uṭhā lūngā," "(first) I will cover thee with my hand, *then* I will lift up my hand." Hence

= "Next after"

(1) It is useful in *enumerations*, specially where there is a little *break* in the sense. *E.gr.* "Khudā ne Kalīsiyā meñ alag alag shakhs muqarrar kiye, pahle rasūl, dūsre nabī, tīsre ustād, *phir* mu'jize dikhānewāle, *phir* shifā denewāle," "God has appointed different persons in the Church, firstly apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, *then* workers of miracles, *next* healers."

In Enumeration

(2) It is a specially good particle wherewith to begin a new paragraph, in which the same general subject is continued, but a new phase of it is introduced.

For New Paragraph

(3) In a dialogue, when one speaker is not replied to at once (if he is, the reply is generally introduced by *no* conjunction), but himself adds something not *immediately* connected with what he has just said, then he introduces this fresh speech with "phir."

For Continuation of Speech

4. Lastly, "phir" stands for "moreover;" and in this case also it is followed by "bhī." *E.gr.* "Terī anugrah kī drishṭi mujh par banī rahe, *phir* is kī bhī sudhi kar ki yah jāti terī hī prajā hai," "continue to look favourably upon me, and *besides this*, take note of the fact that this nation is thy people."

= "**Moreover**"

Section 4.—"Bhalā."

This is commonly an adjective meaning "good;" but like our "well," it is often used not only as an adverb, but as a conjunction, in the following ways.

1. It is used by way of concession, *e.gr.* "bhalā, tū apne pitā ke ghar kā barā abhilāshī hoke chalā āyā to chalā āyā, par mere dewtāoñ ko tū kyoñ churā le āyā hai?", "Granting that thou, having a great longing for thy father's house, camest away" (*i.e.* so far, I am willing to admit that thou didst not do wrong), but why hast thou stolen away my gods?"

Concession

2. It is used with a question, to express surprise that the question should be necessary, *e.gr.* "jo rupaiyā hamāre boroñ ke mohre par niklā thā, jab ham ne us ko Kanān desh se le āke tujhe pher diyā, tab *bhalā* tere swāmī ke ghar meñ se ham koī chāndī wā sone kī vastu kyoñkar le ā sakte haiñ?", "when we brought from the land of Canaan, and return to thee, the money which was found at the mouth of our sacks, then, *say if thou canst*, how could we bring away from thy master's house any silvern or golden article?"

Surprise

3. It is used, like our "indeed," to introduce a generalization from a particular instance; *e.gr.* when Saul has expressed wonder at David's not killing him when he had the chance, he adds: "Bhalā, kyā koī manushya apne shatru ko pākar kushal se jāne detā hai?", "Indeed, does *any* man, if he gets his enemy into his hand, let him go in peace?"

Generalization

Section 5.—"Ab."

1. This word, besides its ordinary meaning of "now," in the sense of "at this present time," often has a meaning which points to the *future*. *E.gr.* "ab maiñ aisā na karūngā" means not "*at* this time," which would be impossible with a future verb, but "*from* this time forward." In such a sentence as this, "phir" *may* be inserted, thus "ab maiñ phir aisā na karūngā;" but it does not add anything to the meaning, which is quite clear from "ab" alone. Indeed, so true is it that "ab" looks to the future, that when one is particular to avoid that tendency, and confine the meaning to the present moment, "hī" is added, and the compound "abhī" formed.

Future meaning

2. There is another "now" in English, which does not refer to time, but may be called the *logical* "now." It introduces the "minor premiss" of a syllogism, or what practically stands for a syllogism. *E.gr.* "where there is smoke, there is fire; *now* here is smoke; therefore here must be fire." "A woman came to the well where Jesus was sitting; *now* his disciples were gone away to buy food; there-

Not logical sense

fore He asked the woman for water." In such cases, "now" should *not* be rendered by "ab;" but often by "jānnā chāhiye ki," lit. "it ought to be known that," and often by "aur," etc.

3. In a narrative of past events, when we wish to say that a certain event took place, or state of things existed, at the time to which we have come in our narrative, we often use the word "now," or "at this time." *E.gr.* in telling of the capture of the ark by the Philistines, we might say "Eli was at this time a very old man." In all such cases, also, "ab" *cannot* be used in Hindustani; but "tab" or "us waqt," etc.

Not of past time

Section 6.—"Ki."

1. There are really two words "ki" in Hindustani, though both come from the same Sanskrit origin, *viz.* the interrogative "kim," "what?" This word came to be, in the course of the development of that language, prefixed to several short words, without changing their meaning; perhaps only to give them more substance. One of these compound words is "kintu," "but," which means the same as "tu" alone (which is the common Sanskrit word for "but"). Another is "kimvā," "or," which means the same as "vā" alone (which is the ordinary Sanskrit for "or"). But "kimvā" was, in the evolution of Hindustani, abbreviated to "ki," and in this form introduces the second of two alternatives in a statement or question. *E.gr.* "Mujhe ma'lūm nahīñ ki wuh bhalā mānush hai ki

One "ki"

burā," "I know not whether he is a good or a bad man;" "Maiñ kal āp ke pās āūñ ki nahīñ?" "Shall I come to you to-morrow, or not?" See more in Chap. XXV, 13.

2. (1) The other word "ki" is a *relative* conjunction. (Relative words are of late formation in all languages; and some languages have not yet any distinct relative formations; and in many, *e.gr.* Latin and English, they have been formed from interrogative words. In Sanskrit and its derivatives, most relative words have a formation of their own, independent of interrogatives; but this word "ki" is an instance of the opposite.) It introduces *clauses* (though sometimes what is in sense a clause is expressed in a single word); sometimes to express a purpose, *e.gr.* "maiñ āyā hūñ ki zindagī dūñ," "I am come to give life," *i.e.* "that I may give life." But commonly "ki" is felt to be too weak to express a purpose alone; and *either* "is liye" or "is wāste," or some words of the same purport, are inserted *before* "ki," *or* in Urdu "tāki," and in Hindi "jis se," is substituted for "ki." In nearly every case, where "ki" stands alone, it introduces a clause which either states a fact, or elucidates a preceding word or statement. In all these cases, it is generally equivalent to the English conjunction "that." *E.gr.* "Merā matlab yih hai, ki is mulk meñ barī barī āfateñ parnewālī haiñ," "my meaning is this, that great calamities are coming on this country;" "maiñ dil se chāhtā hūñ ki āp salāmat raheñ," "I heartily wish that you may remain in prosperity;" "jab unhoñ ne dekhā ki wah nahīñ ātā," "when they perceived that he was not coming." The first of these examples illustrates the fact, that idiom often requires the insertion of "yih" in the clause preceding "ki." *E.gr.* in English we

The Relative Conjunction

might very well say "my meaning is that," etc., without "this;" but in Hindustani it would not be idiomatic to say "Merā matlab hai ki," etc.

(2) This relative conjunction is *not repeated* in Hindustani, though in sense it applies to several co-ordinate clauses. In such cases we *do* repeat "that" in English. *E.gr.* "He told me that the enemy had invaded the country, and that they had committed great excesses therein, and that the people were in great distress, and that there appeared no hope of succour for them." This, in Hindustani, would be "us ne mujh se kahā ki dushmanoñ ne us mulk par chaṛhāī kiī, aur unhoñ ne us meñ baṛī baṛī burāiyāñ kiīñ, aur raʿīyat baṛe dukh meñ hai, aur un kī kumak kī kuchh ummed nahīñ dīkhtī." Here there is only one "ki" to four English "that"s. This same rule applies to other relative conjunctions also, such as "jab," "agar" or "yadi." *E.gr.* "yadi maiñ mar jaūñ, wā merā sārā dhan chhin jāe." "if I should die, or if all my property be carried off." Here we say "or if;" but Hindustanis do not say "wā yadi."

Not Repeated

(3) As a rule, quotations (see Chap. XXXVIII, 1) are introduced by "ki." Not, indeed, always; it is quite permissible to say "us ne mujh se pūchhā, Ap kahāñ rahte haiñ?"; but it is much more common to introduce a "ki." Hence Indians, who know English only imperfectly, would translate that sentence by "he asked me *that* where do you live?"

In Quotation

———

CHAPTER XIX.

How to Render the Words "As" and "Or."

1. When "as" has its original meaning, whether it be adjective or adverb, there is no difficulty in translating it. Even when used as a conjunction, meaning "while" or "in proportion as," it is easily rendered by "jaise" or "jaise jaise," or "jyoñ" or "jyoñ jyoñ." *E.gr.* "jyoñ jyoñ we un ko dukh dete gaye tyoñ tyoñ we baṛhte hue phailte gaye," "as they made them suffer more and more, so they increased and spread more and more;" "jaise jaise we baṛhte gaye waise hī waise we mere viruddh pāp karte gaye," "as they multiplied, so they sinned against me."

Original meaning

2. But we often use the word "as" without any thought of comparison at all. No doubt this thought is at the bottom of this use of the word, but we are not conscious of it when saying "as." It rather expresses the *aspect* under which a thing or person is viewed; and so comes practically to give the *reason* for a statement, etc. In this sense, "as" is rendered in Hindustani by conjunctive participles of three kinds of verbs.

Aspect

(1) When "as" is connected with a verb denoting some kind of action, "karke" is used. *E.gr.* "wahāñ us ko ek pahāṛ ke upar homabali *karke* chaṛhā," "offer him up there on a mountain *as* a burnt offering;" "dūsroñ ko Paramieshwar karke na mānnā," "do not

"Karke"

regard others as God." In all such instances, "karke" is *not necessary* to the sense; but it makes the sentence run clearer and smoother.

(2) When "as" denotes the aspect under which a thing or person is viewed, "jānkar," "samajhkar," "mānkar," or the conjunctive participle of a similar verb, is preferred to "karke." *E.gr.* "Apne āp ko murdoñ meñ se jī uṭhe hue jānkar Khudā ke hawāle karo," "yield yourselves to God *as* those risen from dead," *i.e.* "considering that you are so;" which is almost the same as "because you are so." Again, "ʿAurat ko nāzuk zāt samajhkar us kī ʿizzat karo," "Honour the woman *as* the tenderer person;" "Kyā tum ḍākū mānkar mere pakaṛne ke liye nikle ho?", "Are you come out to arrest me *as* a robber?"

"Jānkar," etc.

(3) When "as" is joined with a verb denoting a *state*, it is rendered by "hokar." *E.gr.* "wuh shatru hokar āegā," "He will come *as* an enemy;" "maiñ apne prabhu kā dās hoke rahne paūñ," "let me stay *as* my lord's slave;" "Maiñ dunyā meñ nūr hokar āyā hūñ," I am come *as* a light into the world."

"Hokar"

3. There is no difficulty about rendering the disjunctive conjunction "or" by "yā" or "wā." But when it stands for "else," foreigners are apt to mistranslate it. "Do this at once, or I will punish you" is not "yih kām abhī karo, *yā* maiñ tum ko sazā dūngā," as most Europeans say; but "*nahiñ to* maiñ tum ko sazā dūngā;" "I had to go away, or I would have suffered much loss," "Mujhe chalā jānā paṛā, *nahiñ to* baṛā nuqsān uṭhātā." See more in Chapter XXIII, 1, 3.

"Or"

CHAPTER XX.

The Particle "Hān."

We now enter on the consideration of four Hindustani particles, *viz.* "Hāñ," "hī," "bhī," and "to." We call them only "particles" (*i.e.* indeclinable words), because it is difficult to say whether they are adverbs or conjunctions; sometimes they appear as the one, sometimes as the other.

Different meanings of "Yes"

1. The English words "yes" and "yea" are used in three different ways, *viz.* (1) as the affirmative answer to a question by another person, *e.gr.* "is it six o'clock yet? Yes." (2) to introduce a corroboration or amplification of a preceding statement by oneself, as in the Bible frequently, *e.gr.* "I will strengthen thee, yea I will help thee;" "I will do this, yes I *will*." (3) to introduce a limitation of what one has just said, or a concession to an opponent of it; *e.gr.* "The Musalmans of India are Sunnīs. Yes, but most of those in Lucknow are Shī'āhs." In this third sense "yes" is but seldom used; commonly "true," "I admit," "indeed" (not, however, as the first word in the sentence; *e.gr.* "Those in Lucknow, indeed, are Shī'āhs"), or some similar word or phrase occurs instead.

2. Now, of these three uses of "yes" or "yea," "hāñ" has the first and third, but *not the second.*

This is one of the mistakes made by the early translators of the Bible, and imitated by Indian Christians in general; who would render the two sentences under (2) in the last paragraph by "maiñ yih kām karūngā, hāñ karūñhīgā;" "Maiñ tujhe quwwat dūngā, hāñ terī madad karūñgā." But this is quite wrong. The former of these sentences should be "maiñ yih kām karūngā, *zarūr hī* ise karūngā;" and the latter, "maiñ tujhe quwwat dūngā, *balki* terī madad bhī karūngā."

"Hāñ" has only two

3. As regards "hāñ" as the affirmative answer to another's question, it is most usual in English to say "yes" without any additional words; but this, though allowable, is not usual in Hindustani. Commonly Hindustanis repeat a word, or words, of the question in an affirmative tone; *e.gr.* "Kyā tū is manushya ke sang jāegī? Us ne kahā, Hāñ, jāūngī," "Wilt thou go with this man? She said, Yes, I will go;" "kyā tū sachmuch merā putra Esāw hī hai? us ne kahā, Hāñ, maiñ hūñ," "Art thou really my son Esau? He said, yes, I am;" "kyā tumhārā ustād misqāl nahīñ detā? Us ne kahā, Hāñ, detā hai," "Does not your master give the half-shekel? He said, yes, he gives it." In all such cases, while "hāñ" alone would have been allowable though less idiomatic, the rest of the answer *without* "hāñ" would not be allowable at all. In English "I will go," "I am," "He gives it" would be quite possible, as the answers to the questions, without "yes;" but in Hindustani "hāñ" must be expressed. Hence in the marriage service, where in English the bride and bridegroom simply answer "I will," the Hindustani is "*Hāñ*, mujhe manzūr hai."

Affirmative

4. In the concessive or limiting sense, "hāñ" is generally, but not necessarily, followed by "to;" and it is *always* followed, at least in the speaker's mind, by some word which means "but" ("adversative"). Instances where it is expressed are: "hāñ, hāl aisā to hai; taubhī maiñ āp kī nahīñ mān saktā," "yes, things are, indeed, as you say; still I cannot agree with you." So, a sentence given above in English may be rendered: "Hindustān ke Musalmān Sunnī haiñ. Hāñ, Lakhnaū ke to Musalmān aksar Shī'āh haiñ; magar bāqī sab Sunnī haiñ."

Limitative

5. But it is by no means necessary that this word signifiying "but" after "hāñ" be *expressed.* An adversative clause must, indeed, always be *implied;* but it need not be *expressed.* In the last sentence above, it would be quite possible to stop at the words "Shī'āh haiñ;" but the remaining clause, or another of the same meaning, would be *implied.* So, when St. Paul, after saying that he had baptized no Corinthian but Crispus and Gaius, recollected that he had also baptized the household of Stephanas, he introduces (in Hindustani) the statement of this fact by "hāñ;" "Hāñ, Stifanās ke khāndān ko bhī maiñ ne baptisma diyā;" and this is followed, not by an adversative clause, but by one which practically comes to the same thing. Again, Abraham, after telling the king of Sodom that he would take nothing from him, makes an apparent exception (though really it was not one), saying "Par hāñ, jo kuchh jawān logoñ ne khā liyā hai, aur jo purush mere sang chale un kā bhāg to maiñ pher na dūngā," "O but, I will not return to thee what the young men have eaten, or the portions of the men who went with me." Here the clause is implied, "but,

"But" not always expressed

with these exceptions, I adhere to my former declaration." So, "maiñ apnī buzurgī nahīñ chāhtā; hāñ, ek hai jo use chāhtā hai."

6. Quite unconnected with the "hāñ" of which we have been speaking in this chapter is another word "hāñ," which resembles it only in form and sound. It is derived from the Sanskrit "sthānc," "at the place," and in use exactly corresponds with the French "chez," which originally meant "at the house." *E.gr.* "wah Kāshināth nām Pandit ke hāñ utare haiñ," "he is putting up with a Pandit named Kāshināth;" "hamāre hāñ bahut puāl hai," "we have much straw," lit. "much straw is at our place." But this word is in vogue only in the West of Hindustan. In the East, its origin being forgotten, it has been altered to "yahāñ," "here;" which of course is really meaningless in this connexion. See Chap. XXIV, 3 (1).

CHAPTER XXI.

The Particle "Hī."

The Emphatic Particle

1. The radical use of this very useful particle is to express *emphasis*. Of this we first give some examples. "Shāgird pahile Antākiyā hī meñ Masīhī kahlāe," "Antioch was the first place where the disciples were called Christians." Here, if "hī" were omitted, the sentence might mean that first, *i.e.* before some other event, the

disciples were called Christians in Antioch, without any stress on the place where they were so called. "Jis tarah wuh Khudāwand Yeshūʿ Masīh ke fazl hī se najāt pāenge, usī tarah ham bhī pāenge," "as they will be saved by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ" (and by nothing else), "even so we also shall be saved" Here, without "hī," the former part of the sentence would mean that, by the grace of the Lord (as we often interject "thank God!" in a sentence), they would be saved; and no stress would be laid on the *means* of their salvation. "Us ne ham se girgiṛāke bintī kiī aur ham ne us kī na sunī, isī kāran ab ham is sankaṭ meñ paṛe haiñ," "he besought us and we did not listen to him, for *this* cause we are now come into this distress." Here, if it had been "is kāran," and not "isī kāran," the stress would have been on the fact of their having come into distress, and not on the cause of it. Hence, the shifting of "hī" in a sentence changes the drift of the sentence; *e.gr.* "maiñ hī wuh kām kartā thā," "it was I that was doing that work;" "maiñ wuhī kām kartā thā," "that was the work I was doing;" "maiñ wuh kām kartā hī thā," "I was just in the act of doing that work."

With Participles

2. This last is an example of the rule, that when "hī" is added to a participle, it indicates the exact time at which the action is, was, or will be, performed. *E.gr.* "Lūt ke Soar ke nikaṭ pahunchte hī sūraj uday huā," "just as Lot was arriving near Zoar, the sun rose;" "bihān ko, bhor hote hī we manushya bidā hue," "next day, at break of dawn, those men were dismissed;" "we nagar se nikle hī the, aur dūr jāne na pāe, ki," "they had just gone out of the city, and had not gone far" (lit. "had not been able to go far"), "when, etc." So, in what we have called the "actual" present and imperfect (see Chap. XV, 3, 2),

when the actuality is intended to be emphasized, "hī" is inserted between the root-form of the verb and the simple past of "rahnā." *E.gr.* "wuh bol hī rahā thā, ki ek nūrānī bādal ne un par sāya kiyā," "he was just in the act of speaking, when a bright cloud overshadowed them." When the verb is "kahnā," the "hī" is sometimes blended with its root form. *E.gr.* "we aisī bāteñ kahī rahe the," "they were just in the act of saying such things."

With "yih"

3. As the pronoun "yih" (or "yah") may refer, in a narrative or discourse, *either* to what is gone before *or* to what is just about to be said, the rule is that in the former case "hī" is added (but blended with the pronoun, forming "yihī" or "yahī," and "isī"), but in the latter it is not. (The same rule applies to "aisā," "itnā," and similar words; only in their case there is no blending with "hī.") The latter part of this rule is absolute; the former is not, but should be observed at least whenever any ambiguity would arise from its non-observance. A good example, where the two parts of the rule apply to the same sentence, is "Barā aur pahilā hukm yihī hai; aur dūsrī, us kī mānind, yih hai ki," "this" (*i.e.* "the one I have just quoted") "is the greatest and first commandment; and the second, like to it, is this," *i.e.* "the one I am just about to quote.' Examples of the former part of the rule are: "Hāñ, maiñ aisī hī kiriyā khāūngā," said by Abraham to Abimelech, when the latter had asked him to swear eternal friendship to him and his posterity. "Kyā yih bāteñ isī tarah par haiñ?", "Are these things so?", *i.e.* as thy accusers have said they are. "Us ne us se khatna kā ʿahd bāndhā, aur isī hālat meñ Ibrāhīm se Isḥāq paidā huā," "He made with him the covenant of circumcision, and in this state" (*i.e.* "of being circumcised") "Isaac was born of Abraham.'

4. "Hī" often occurs with the second of two words which are contrasted with each other as incompatible, to indicate *which* alternative is preferred. *E.gr.* "Pilānchāroñ ke pradhān ne Yūsuph ko smaran na rakkhā, baran us ko bhūl hī gayā," "The chief butler did not remember Joseph, but, so far from that, he forgot him;" "hamāre liye van meñ marne se Misriyoñ kī sewā karnī hī achchhī thī," "serving the Egyptians would have been better for us than dying in the wilderness;" "manushya par sahārā karne se Yahowā hī par bharosā rakhnā bhalā hai," "It is better to trust in Jehovah than to lean upon man;" "unheñ srāp kī santī āshīsh hī dilāī," "instead of a curse, made him bestow a *blessing*."

In Alternatives

5. "Hī" is added to "aur" to show that the latter word is used not inclusively, but exclusively. *E.gr.* "yih sab ke sab Qaisar ke hukmoñ kī mukhālafat karke kahte haiñ ki bādshāh to aur hī hai," "all these oppose Cæsar's decrees, and say that the king is some one else." Here, if "hī" had been omitted after "aur," the meaning would have been only that "there is another king besides him;" which accusation would have been bad enough, but less than the accusers meant. Again, "Hāñ, āp kā mat to aisā hī hogā, par merā mat aur hī hai," "No doubt this" (*i.e.* "which you have just mentioned") "is your opinion, but mine is different."

Exclusiveness

6. Often, where it appears to us foreigners that "bhī" should be used rather than "hī," the natives use the latter. *E.gr.* "tāki jab Patras āe to us kā sāya hī un meñ se kisī par par jāe," "so that, when Peter should come, at least his shadow

Instead of "bhi"

might fall on some one of them." Here, *we* think of the shadow as the least possible part of Peter; but Hindustanis regard it rather as a thing to be emphasized.

7. From the idea of emphasis naturally comes that of singularity; accordingly, "hī" is often best translated by "only." Indeed, with cardinal numerals this is the most idiomatic way of expressing "only;" *e.gr.* "ek hī," "only one;" "tīn hī," "only three," and so on. [Here it should be observed, that when "the same" means "only one," it is translated into Hindustani by "ek hī;" otherwise by "wuhī." In other words, when "the same" refers to two persons or things which have something in common *with each other*, "ek hī" is right; but when it refers to some person or thing *apart from* what has last been mentioned, "wuhī" (or "waisā hī" or "utnā hī," etc.) should be said. *E.gr.* "Sawāb kī bābat Hinduoñ aur Musalmānoñ kī ek hī rāe hai," "on the subject of merit, Hindus and Musalmāns have the same opinion;" but if we wanted to say "Hindus trust in meritorious deeds, and Musalmans do the same," we should have to say "Hindū sawāb par bharosā rakhte haiñ, aur Musalmān bhī waisā hī karte haiñ," or "Musalmānoñ kā bhī wuhī hāl hai."] Yet one should beware of supposing, as many foreigners do, that this is the only meaning of "hī," or that it overrides its ordinary meaning of emphasis. *E.gr.* Pharaoh's decree about the Israelites, that "iṇṭoñ kī gintī utnī hī denī paṛegī," and "din din utnā hī kām pūrā karnā paṛegā," is an example of No. 3, and means that they were to give the same number of bricks, and do the same amount of work, *as before.* Pharaoh certainly did not mean that they were to work *only* as hard as before!

= "Only"

8. "Hī" is often idiomatically used when a sen-

tence is put in an unnatural order for emphasis' sake, apparently without expressing any further emphasis; *e.gr.* "tumhārī zindagī chīz hī kyā hai?", "what contemptible little thing is your life?"

In Unnatural Order

9. As to the *place* in the sentence in which "hī" should be put, the rule is that it comes immediately after the word which is meant to be emphasized. A good example of this is given under No. 1 of this chapter, where the meaning of the sentence varies according to the word, immediately after which "hī" comes. This rule is in most parts of Hindustan so adhered to, that "hī" comes even between a noun (or pronoun) and a postposition; *e.gr.* "usī ne yih kām kiyā," "he it is, that did this;" "maiñ ghar hī ko jātā hūñ," "home is where I am going;" "Masīh āsmān hī par se āyā," "Heaven is where Christ came from." But in the special idiom of Delhi, "hī" comes after the postposition; *e.gr.* "maiñ ne hī us ko bhejā," "it was I that sent him."

Place of "Hī"

10. When a word is reduplicated (see Chap. XXXIX, 6), and at the same time emphasized, "hī" comes, not after the two words, but *between* them; *e.gr.* "sab log apne hī apne laṛkebāloñ se prem rakhte haiñ," "all people love each one his own children;" "maiñ tum ko do hī do paise dūngā," "I will give you only two pice each;" "dhīre hī dhīre chalo," "proceed *slowly*" (emphatically). We have already mentioned (Chap. XV, section 8, 1) that when "hī" is added to a future tense, it is not put at the end, but inserted before the terminations which are derived from the Sanskrit verb for "to go;" *e.gr.* "jo kuchh us ne kahā, so wah karehīgā," "what he said, he will certainly do." To this

we now add, that "hī" is put in the middle of other compound words also, or (perhaps a more correct description) before other affixes; *e.gr.* "dūsre sthān par chal, jahāñ se tū un meñ se bāhar hī wāloñ ko dekh sake," "come along to another place, whence thou mayest be able to see only those among them, who are outside."

In Apodosis of Relative Sentence

11. "Hī" is idiomatically added in the apodosis of a sentence, the protasis of which is relative, though it may not be evident to a foreigner that any emphasis is needed. *E.gr.* "jis tarah Masīh dunyā meñ chalā, *usī* tarah Masīhioñ ko bhī chalnā chāhiye;" "jahāñ lāsheñ parī rahengī, *wahīñ* giddh jamaʿ ho jāenge."

CHAPTER XXII.

The Particle "Bhī."

More used than in English

1. This particle corresponds to the English "also" or "too," and "even;" the context decides which of these words to translate it by. But it occurs in Hindustani much more frequently than the above words do in English. The cause of this is, that Hindustanis use it with reference rather to the *sense* than the strict grammar. *E.gr.* "apne tel meñ se kuchh hameñ bhī do" would not

be rightly rendered in English by "give us, too, of your oil," because that would imply "as well as to others," which is not meant; but only by "give us of your oil." Why, then, do Hindustanis insert a "bhī" there? Because the *result* of that petition being granted would be that the foolish virgins had some oil *as well as* the wise ones. Again, "Maiñ ne sair karte aur tumhāre maʿbūdoñ par ghaur karte waqt ek aisī qurbāngāh bhī dekhī jis par yih likhā thā," "as I strolled along and contemplated your objects of worship, I saw an altar on which this was written." Here, if "also" were inserted in English, it would imply that the altar was not one of their objects of worship; but in Hindustani the insertion of "bhī" shows that *it also*, besides others, was an object of worship.

2. In the above instances, and many others like them, "bhī" is used where *no* corresponding English word occurs; but besides these, there are many cases in which "also" or "even" in English would not be misleading, only it is not idiomatic. *E.gr.* "yah tujh se dūr ho, ki dushṭ ke sang dharmī ko bhī mār ḍāle," "this be far from thee, to slay the righteous with the wicked" (because that would be slaying him *besides* the wicked); "wah use us ke nikaṭ le āyā, aur us ne khāyā, and wuh us ke pās dākhmadhu bhī lāyā and us ne piyā," "he brought it near to him, and he ate it, and he brought him wine" (as well as food), "and he drank it;" "un manushyoñ ne wah bhenṭ and wah dūnā rūpaiyā apne sāth liyā; and Binyāmīn ko bhī sang leke chal diye," "those men took with them that present and that double money; and taking Benjamin" (besides the above-mentioned things) "with them, they departed;" "maiñ marne se bhī prasanna hūñ, kyoñki tujh jīte jāgte kā muñh bhī dekhā," "I am content to die" (and not only suffer anything less), "because I have seen the face" (and not only heard the voice) "of

thee alive and well;" "ʿaqlmandoñ ne apnī mashʿaloñ ke sāth apnī kuppiyoñ meñ tel bhī le liyā," "the wise ones took oil in their jars with their torches" (and therefore besides their torches); "jo tū paṛhtā hai use samajhtā bhī hai?", "dost thou understand what thou art reading?" (*i.e.* reading is not enough, understanding *also* is necessary).

3. There are two special cases, in which "bhī" is used where we use no corresponding word. One is in the apodosis of correlative sentences, where the protasis and apodosis contain the same thought; *e.gr.* "jis tarah tum ilzām lagāte ho, usī tarah tum par bhī ilzām lagāyā jāegā," "as you find fault, so shall fault be found with you" (*viz.* "with you as well as those, with whom you find fault"); "jitnā dukh ham auroñ ko dete haiñ, utnā ham ko bhī sahnā hogā," "we shall have to suffer as much pain as we inflict on others;" "jab wuh kitāb mujhe paṛhāī jāegī, tab maiñ use auroñ ko bhī paṛhāūngā," "when some one teaches me that book, I will teach it to others." The other case is in a speech really boastful, but in language only putting oneself on a level with others; *e.gr.* "Thiyūdās ne uṭhkar daʿwa kiyā thā ki maiñ bhī kuchh hūñ," "Theudas arose and claimed to be somebody" (*i.e.* as well as others); "Shamaʿūn yih kahtā thā ki maiñ bhī koī baṛā shakhs hūñ," "Simon used to say he was some great person."

In Apodosis

4. The ordinary place of "bhī," like that of "hī," is immediately after the word with which it is connected in sense; so that here, also, a sentence may vary its meaning according to the place which "bhī" occupies in it. *E.gr.* "maiñ bhī yih kahtā hūñ," "I (as well as others) say this;" "maiñ

Place of "bhī"

yih bhī kahtā hūñ," "I say *this*" (as well as other things); "maiñ yih kahtā bhī hūñ," "I *say* this" (as well as think it),

Exceptions

5. But "bhī" admits of more exceptions to this rule than "hī" admits to the corresponding rule. Whereas "hī," in most parts of the country, comes between a noun and a post-position, "bhī" *never* does. It is always, *e.gr.* "unhoñ ne bhī yih kahā," "they, too, said this;" never "unhoñ bhī ne." Again, Hindustani seeks to avoid ending a sentence, or a clause, with "bhī;" and therefore, wherever possible, it puts it before what now becomes the last word. *E.gr.* "Ise le bhī lo," "take this" (*viz.* and not only talk about it); "yih kām bhī karo," "*do* this" (*viz.* as well as consider it); never "le lo bhī," or "kām karo bhī," though the "bhī" refers *in sense* to "le lo" and "kām karo." So "tum yih karte bhī rahoge" (not "tum yih karte rahoge bhī"), though the "bhī" belongs in sense to "rahoge," "you will *continue* also doing this," *viz.* not satisfied with having done it, or even doing it now.

Again, "wuh tumheñ ākhir tak qāim bhī rakkhegā," "he will also keep you firm to the end;" where the "bhī" refers to the whole composite verb, "qāim rakkhegā." Indeed, often "bhī" is followed by two or more words; which words belong to it in sense quite as much as the preceding words; *e.gr.* "us ne Bāl kī vedī ko girā diyā aur us ke pās kī asherā ko bhī kāṭ ḍālā," "he overthrew the altar of Baal, and also cut down the Asherah which was by it." Here, the "bhī" refers to the whole clause, "us ke pās kī asherā ko kāṭ dālā," and yet it is put between the verb and its object. For if it had been put between "kāṭ" and "dālā," the sense would have been that he cut down the Asherah *besides* having done something else to it. In this

example, the subject of the two clauses is the same, *viz.* Gideon; but where each clause has its own subject, "bhī" must be put after the *subject* of the second clause, though in sense it refers to the whole of that clause. *E.gr.* "merī suno, to Parameshwar bhī tumhārī sunegā," "listen to me, then God will attend to you." Here, if the "bhī" had been put after "tumhārī," it would have implied that God would hear others besides "you;" and if it had been put after "sunegā" (or, to avoid its coming at the end, if "sun bhī legā" had been said), it would have implied that God would *hear* "you," as well as do something else to "you." But though one might say that putting it after "Parameshwar" implies that God, as well as some one else, would hear "you," as a matter of fact it does *not* convey this meaning to a Hindustani, unless the context should demand it.

6. But though "bhī" may thus precede many words to which in sense it belongs, *it can never precede the whole* of the words to which in sense it belongs. The Urdu "nīz" *is*, indeed, employed in this way (*e.gr.* "aur nīz yih," "and this also"); but "bhī," *never*.

Never First

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE PARTICLE "TO."

Really, there are two words "to" in Hindustani, with different origins in Sanskrit; and remembering this will greatly lessen the difficulty which foreigners have in acquiring the right use of these particles. A good way of distinguishing them is to notice the place which each of them occupies in a sentence; for the one "to" *must* come *first* in its clause, and the other *must never* occupy that place, but the place which "hī" and "bhī" generally have, *i.e.* immediately after the word to which in sense it belongs.

Two words

I. 1. One "to"* *introduces the apodosis* of a conditional sentence, and in Urdu of a temporal sentence also. *E.gr.* "agar tū chāhe, to mujhe pāk sāf kar saktā hai," "if thou wilt, thou canst cleanse me;" "yadi āp krodh na karte, to maiñ āp ko mīṭhā uttar detā," "if you had not got angry, I would have given you a soft answer." In the case of temporal sentences, the Hindi, while sometimes using "to" in the apodosis, yet greatly prefers "tab," which is the proper word for "then" in the sense of "at that time;" but Urdu, for some reason or other, dislikes "tab," and uses "to" in temporal, as well as condional, sentences; *e.gr.* "jab kāmil āegā, *to* nāqis jātā rahegā," "when the perfect is come, the imperfect will vanish."

In Apodosis

* *This* "to" is always un-emphatic, and should be pronounced with the vowel very short. See Chap. II, 3 (4) (a).

2. In conditional sentences, the usage in Hindi and Urdu differs in another respect also. In Urdu, while the word for "if" in the protasis must be expressed, the word for "then" in the apodosis *may* be, and often is, omitted; *e.gr.* "agar tū hai mujhe hukm de ki pānī par chalke tere pās āūñ," "if it is thou, bid me come to thee on the water;" in both these respects the usage being the same as in English. But in Hindi, while the word for "if" is often omitted, the "to" *must* be expressed. *E.gr.* "mere pās paisā nahīñ; hotā, to detā," "I have no coppers by me; if I had, I would give [you some];" "yah laṛāī âur bahut din tak banī rahe, to sab ke sab nāsh ho jāenge," "if this war lasts much longer, all will be destroyed." This, too, has a parallel in a common English construction; *e.gr.* the above sentences might just as well be "*had* I coppers, etc." and "*should* this war last, etc." This omission of the word for "if" in the protasis, and retention of "to" in the apodosis, is specially found when "to" is followed by the same verb, and in the same form, as precedes it. One example, "tū chalā āyā to chalā āyā," we have already (Chap. XVIII, section 4, 1) given in another connexion. But this construction is mostly found when the preceding and following verbs are in the *imperative*. *E.gr.* "yih kām karo to karo," "do this if you like," "we nagar kī chāroñ or ghūmeñ to ghūmeñ," "let them go round about the city if they will;" "tumhārā sang Yahowā de to de," "let Jehovah help you if He will," *i.e.* "I am sure no one else will." In such sentences, as is plain, there is an omission of the particle introducing the apodosis. *E.gr.* the full form of the first would be "agar tum yih kām karnā chāho, to karo." See further in Chap. XXXIX, 11.

Difference in Hindi and Urdu

3. A specially common instance of this reverse tendency of Hindi and Urdu is found in their words for

"Nahīñ to"

"else," *i.e.* "if not." The Urdu is "warna," which is a contraction of 'wa," "and;" "ar," for "agar," "if;" and "na,' "not;" the word for "if" being expressed, but the word for "then" being omitted, as in English. *E.gr.* "warna jo log murdoñ ke liye baptisma lete haiñ, wuh kyā karenge?", "else, what shall those people do who are baptized for the dead?" *i.e.* "*if* what I have just said is *not* true, then," etc. In the Hindi "nahīñ to," on the contrary, we find the opposite tendency exemplified. *E.gr.* "mere Bāp ke ghar meñ bahut se makān haiñ; nahīñ to maiñ tum se kah detā," "in my Father's house are many abodes, *else* I would have told you;" "phir aisā kām na karnā, nahīñ to tum ko sazā milegī," "don't do such a thing again, *else* you will be punished." Here the "nahīñ to" stands for "agar aisā na hotā, to," and "agar tum merā yih hukm na māno, to.'

Idiomatically Used

4. But often "nahīñ to" occurs in Hindustani, where the suppressed protasis is not nearly as evident as in the above examples, and where therefore "else" is not used in English. *E.gr.* "us ne jān būjhke aisā kiyā, nahīñ to jeṭhā Manashshe hī thā," "he did this purposely, but the elder was Manasseh." Here "nahīñ to" seems to imply a process of thought like this: "if he had *not* done it intentionally, *then* he would not have done it at all, for he knew that Manasseh was the elder." Again, "agar āp yih hukm mujhe tākīdan dete haiñ to maiñ uṭhkar use bajā lāūngā, nahīñ to bīmār maiñ hūñ hī," "if you positively order me to do this, I will get up and do it; but really I *am* ill;" implying "but if you are not so positive, you will consider that," etc. So, in speaking of our Lord riding into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday, one can add "nahīñ to wah sadā sab kahīñ paidal hī jātā

thā," "but on all other occasions and in all other places He went on foot." Again, "Khudā ham se nazreñ qubūl to kartā hai, lekin yih sirf us kī mihrbānī hī hai; nahīñ to wuh kisī chīz kā muhtāj nahīñ ho saktā."

Sach Pūchho to

5. Another common idiom is "sach pūchho" (or "pūchhiye") "to," lit. "should you ask the truth, then." It commonly corresponds with our "in fact," *i.e.* "the fact is." *E.gr.* "ham ne to use dusht samjhā thā, par sach pūchho to wah barā hī sajjan thā," "we thought him wicked, but really" (or "in fact," or "the fact is, that") "he was a *very* good man."

Concessive

II. 1. The other "to" has a *concessive* force, the same as "hāñ" (Chap. XX, 4); but it is very much more commonly used than "hāñ," which *may*, in fact, be omitted, and in fact generally is omitted, where this "to" is to follow. Like "hī" and "bhī," its place in a sentence determines the meaning of the sentence. *E.gr.* "wah mujh se to prem rakhtā, par mere bhāī se nahīñ rakhtā," "he loves *me*, indeed, but does not love my brother;" "wah to mujh se prem rakhtā hai, par us kā bhāī nahīñ rakhtā," "*he*, indeed, loves me, but his brother does not;" "wah mujh se prem to rakhtā hai, par kabhī kabhī mujh se udās bhī hotā hai," "he *loves* me, indeed, but sometimes is displeased with me."

Place of "to"

2. With one exception (see No. 8 below), this "to" does not come at the *end* of a clause; and where it would naturally come in that place, the word "sahī" (a corruption of the Arabic "sahīh," "correct") is added; *e.gr.* "wah mujh se prem rakhtā to sahī, par kyā jāniye kab tak rakhtā rahe," "he does, indeed, love me, but there is no knowing how long he will do so;"

"maiñ ne tujhe dukh diyā to sahī, par ab na dūngā," "true, I have given you pain, but I will do so no more."

3. The above examples illustrate the fact, that *generally* this "to" is followed, in the next clause, by a word signifying "but." But it is also, very often, followed by "aur," "phir," or some other conjunction. *E.gr.* "tīs to ūnṭaniyāñ aur chālīs gāyeñ," "thirty she-camels and forty cows;" "hamārā rupaiyā to chuk hī gayā aur ab hamāre sab prakār ke pashu bhī tere pās ā chuke haiñ," "our money is all gone, and now our animals of all kinds have come into thy possession;" "Yahowā din ko to bādal ke khambhe meñ aur rāt ko āg ke khambhe meñ hokar," "Jehovah, being by day in a pillar of cloud, and by night in a pillar of fire;" "unhoñ ne achchhī achchhī to bartanoñ meñ jamaʿ kar liīñ, aur burī burī phenk diīñ," "they gathered the good [fishes] into vessels, and threw the bad away;" "pahile apnī ānkh meñ se to shahtīr nikāl, phir apne bhāī kī ānkh meñ se tinke ko achchhī tarah dekhkar nikāl sakegā," "first take the beam out of thine own eye, then wilt thou be able to see clearly to take the mote out of thy brother's eye."

How Followed

4. Often the contrast, or difference, implied in "to," is not with the following at all, but with the preceding. *E.gr.* "jo terā vañsh kahlāegā so Ishāk hī se chalegā. Hāñ, is dāsī ke putra se bhī to maiñ ek jāti upajāūngā," "the posterity which will be called thine will spring from Isaac. True, I will cause a nation to spring from this maidservant's son also;" "us ne ek âur kūāñ khudwāyā, aur us ke liye to unhoñ ne jhagṛā na kiyā," "he dug another well (by his servants' hands), and for *it* they did not quarrel," *viz.* as they had done for the other wells.

Contrast with Preceding

5. Often, again, there is no contrast or difference *expressed* at all, either before or after; but it is *implied;* though commonly the speaker is not conscious of any such implication. *E.gr.* if one asks one's servant "gāṛī āī hai?", "Is the carriage come?", he will probably answer, "Abhī to nahīñ āī," "it is not yet come;" but he has at the back of his mind "but I dare say it will come soon," or some similar thought, and *therefore* he inserts "to." So, "wuh mere beṭe kā to lihāz karenge," "they will respect my *son*," *viz.* though they have not respected my servants. Again, "tumhārā āsmānī Bāp to apne māngnewāloñ ko achchhī chīzeñ zarūr hī degā," "your heavenly Father at all events" [whatever earthly fathers may do] "will surely give good things to them that ask of Him;" "yih ādmī aisā to kuchh nahīñ kartā jo qatl yā qaid ke lāiq ho," "this man does nothing worthy of death or prison," *viz.* though, for all I know, he may do many things worthy of other treatment; "Masīh to ek hī hai; pas is kā kyā sabab hai, ki zaitūn ke darakht do nazar āe?", "Christ is one," this we assume; "then why did two olive trees appear?" (which seems so contrary to that assumption).

Contrast only Implied

6. Sometimes the insertion of "to" makes all tho difference to the right understanding of a sentence, by removing a possible ambiguity. *E.gr.* with regard to the woman mentioned in Luke 13:11, interpreters differ as to whether she was wholly unable to straighten herself, or whether she was able to do so partially, but not completely. The former meaning might be expressed by "wuh bi'lkull sīdhī na ho saktī thī," the latter *must* be expressed, if ambiguity is to be avoided, by "wuh bi'lkull to sīdhī na ho saktī thī." Again, Musalmans for many years

Removes Ambiguity

made a great deal of the old version of Matt. 7: 21, "Na har ek jo mujhe Khudāwand, Khudāwand kahte haiñ āsmān kī bādshāhat meñ dākhil hogā." How they extracted, even from this translation, the meaning that every one who calls Jesus Lord will be excluded from the kingdom of heaven, it is difficult to say; but they did so. Anyhow, that false interpretation is excluded by the insertion of "to." "Jitne mujh se Ai Khudāwand, ai Khudāwand, kahte haiñ, wuh sab *to* āsmān kī bādshāhat meñ dākhil na hoñge;" meaning, *many* of them *may* enter there, but *not all.*

7. "To" is also inserted to shew that a statement is such as is, or ought to be, generally, if not universally, conceded. Very often in such cases, we say "of course." *E.gr.* "mujhe wahāñ bhāg jāne de, kyoñki wah chhoṭā to hai hī," "let me flee there, for it is (as you see) a little place;" Yūsuph ko leke ek garhe meñ ḍāl diyā, garhā to sūkhā thā," "they took Joseph and cast him into a pit; the pit (be it understood) was dry;" "bhāī to apnā hāṛ hī māñs hai," "a brother (of course) is one's very bone and flesh;" "wāris to yihī hai," "this (as we all know) is the heir;" "kharā ho, maiñ bhī to insān hūn," "stand up, I also (as you see) am a man;" "terī strī Sārā kahāñ hai? us ne kahā, wah to tambū meñ hai," "where is Sarah thy wife? he said, she is (of course) in in the tent;" "hāñ, mere putra hī kā to angarkhā hai," "yes, it is my son's coat (and no doubt about it)."

= "**of course**"

8. When added to a verb in the imperative, "to" imparts a peremptoriness to the command or request. *E.gr.* "mujhe batā to, kyā tum ne zamīn itne hī ko bechī?", "tell me now, did you sell the land for only so much?" This is the case alluded to above, when "to'

Peremptory

may come at the end of a clause. But even here, if it can come in the middle of a compound verb, it seems to prefer it; *e.gr.* "tū us ko mere hāth meñ sauñp to de," "just you deliver him up to me;" "utar to jā," "you go down" (and do not stay here making excuses). Indeed, in *writing* one should *avoid* ending a clause with "to," for fear the reader, thinking it to be the first kind of "to," should carry it on to the next clause.

Gentle doubt

9. When Hindustanis have some little doubt about a thing, and wish to express it as softly as possible, they put "to nahīñ" at or near the end of the sentence, raising the voice slightly as for a question; *e.gr.* "āp chale jāenge to nahīñ," "you won't go away, will you?"; "is mahīne meñ aur tihwār to na parenge," "there will fall no more holidays this month, will there?"; "wuh bi'lkull dīwānā to nahīñ huā," "he has not become quite mad, has he?"; "âur koī chīz to nahīñ chāhiye," "you don't want anything more, do you?" Also, without a negative, to express all but complete certainty; *e.gr.* "sab kushal kshem to hai?", "all is well with you, is it not?", *i.e.* "I hope all is well with you?"

Not really emphatic

10. It will be seen that, in many of the above examples, the second "to" conveys an *emphasis* to the sentence or clause; and therefore many call it an emphatic particle. But really, the emphatic sense which it often bears is accidental to it. It is only because one often emphasizes a fact, or a thought, which one concedes in view of a different fact or thought which one is going to mention. And where there is no concession either expressed or implied, "to" cannot be employed merely for emphasis, but this must be expressed by "hī," or in some other way.

CHAPTER XXIV.

A Table of Correspondent Words.

	Pronoun.	Time.	Place.	Direction.	Quantity or Number.	Quality or Manner.	Cause.	Condition.
Simple Third Person ...	So	Tab	Tahāñ	Tidhar	Tiṭnā	Taisā, tyoñ	.....	To
Proximate ...	Yah or yih	Ab	Yahāñ	Idhar	Itnā	Aisā.	.....	.....
Remote ...	Wah or Wuh	.....	Wahāñ	Udhar	Utnā	Waisā, woñ.	.....	.....
Interrogative	Kaun, kyā	Kab	Kahāñ	Kidhar	Kitnā	Kaisā, Kyoñkar	Kyoñ	.....
Relative ...	Jo	Jab	Jahāñ	Jidhar	Jitnā	Jaisā, jyoñ	.....	Yadi, agar
Indefinite ...	Koī, kuchh	Kabhī	Kahīñ	Kidhar hī	Kitnā	Kaisā hī	.....	.. ...

1. From this table it will be seen that, *on the whole,* (1) all the words in each *horizontal* line *begin* with the same letter; and (2) all the words in the same *perpendicular* line *end* with the same syllable. *But* (1) the initial letter of words denoting the simple third person, which was originally t, has become s in the pronoun. This modification had already taken place in Sanskrit, which Hindustani simply follows in this; also in Greek; *viz.* the substitution of s for t, as being softer, and easier to pronounce. (2) In Sanskrit, both a and i are the initial letters of words denoting the proximate; some words begin with the one, and some with the other. This also has been just followed by Hindustani; only (*a*) it turns i into y before vowels, and (*b*) in one instance it combines the a and the i into ai. (3) The original initial letter of words signifying the remote was u; but Hindustani substitutes w for this before a vowel. (4) The initial letter of the Interrogatives is consistently k; and that of the Relatives is j throughout; and Indefinites are, for the most part, formed from the corresponding Interrogatives by adding "hī." Only, in one instance the "hī" has become "ī;" in another, "āñ hī" has been crushed into "hīñ;" and "koī" and "kuchh" are not formed with "hī" at all, but direct from Sanskrit. (5) As was remarked in Chap. X, 6, all the words denoting the simple third person are, *with the single exception of* "*to*," obsolete in Urdu, and *(with the exception of* "*tab*"*)* obsolescent in Hindi. In the latter they (except "tab") are employed chiefly in *correlative* clauses, *i.e.* those which *answer to* relative clauses; thus, "so" answers to "jo," "tahāñ" to "jahāñ," "tidhar" to "jidhar," "titnā" to "jitnā," "taisā" to "jaisā," "tyoñ" to "jyoñ." But even in these, Urdu always, and Hindi increasingly, employ the "remote" words instead. (In English, the

Explanation of the Table

opposite process has taken place; the words denoting the simple third person, *e.gr.* "that," "then," "there," "thither," "thus," "therefore," and "so" have, besides their proper meaning, with one exception taken the place of the "remote" words. That exception is the Pronoun, "he," "she," and "it;" whose existence in the language has caused "that" to be generally confined to the "remote" sense.) (6) "Tyoñ," "woñ," and "jyoñ" are used in Hindi; Urdu does not use "tyoñ" at all, and turns "woñ" into "wūñ," and "jyoñ" into "jyūñ;" also "kyoñ" into "kyūñ."

Empty Spaces

2. It will also be noticed that many places in the above table are empty. (1) There is no word for "remote" Time; "tab," which properly belongs to the Simple Third Person, is used for it in Hindi; and "to," "us waqt," etc. for it in Urdu. (2) Strictly speaking, there is no one word denoting Cause, in *any* of the six divisions. But in the Interrogative division, "kyoñ" (in Urdu "kyūñ") has been taken from the column for "Manner," and put in that for "Cause." In other words, "kyoñ," which originally meant "How?", has come to mean "why?"; and therefore, to form a word for "how?", "kar" has been added to it. (3) In the column for "condition," Hindustani has separate words only in the Simple Third Person and the Relative. For the latter, Urdu borrows the Persian "agar"; literary Hindi uses the Sanskrit "yadi"; in ordinary Hindustani the pronoun "jo" is often used for "if"; but perhaps oftenest, in the language of the people, *no* word is used, but the tense of the verb shows that the clause is conditional. (4) In place of the words marked as non-existent in the table, Hindustani uses combinations of existent and common words; *e.gr.* "us sabab" in Urdu, and "us kāran" in

Hindi, for "for that reason," "therefore;" "kis shart par" for "on what condition?", etc.

3. (1) It has not been thought necessary to give in the Table the modified forms of the Pronouns, which they assume before postpositions; *i.e.* "so" becomes "tis" in the singular, and "tin" in the plural (much less used even than "so"), "yah" or "yih" becomes "is" in the singular, and "in" in the plural; and similarly "wah" or "wuh" becomes "us" and "un"; "kaun" becomes "kis" and "kin"; "kyā" becomes, properly speaking, "kāhe"—*e.gr.* "kāheko?", "why?", lit. "for what?"—but this form is not recognized in Urdu, and is obsolescent in Hindi, "kis" having taken its place; "jo" becomes "jis" and "jin;" and "koī" becomes "kisī" in the singular. (2) "Yahāñ" is mistakenly used in the East of Hindustan for "hāñ" in the sense of "at the place." (See Chap. XX, 6.) *E.gr.* "us ke yahāñ," "at his place." The proper meaning of "yahāñ," *viz.* "here," "at *this* place," cannot suit such a connexion; and the word seems to have become common in this sense, only because of the other (*i.e.* the affirmative) meaning of "hāñ," and the wish to avoid ambiguity. (3) Owing to the similarity in sound between the words in the column for "Direction" and the English words "whither," "hither," and "thither," many English people mistake the meaning of the former. These English words mean "*to* which place," "*to* this place," and "*to* that place," and are thus distinguished from (though in modern English they have been largely superseded by) "where," "here," and "there," which properly mean only "*at* which place," "*at* this place," "*at* that place." But the Hindustani words in question mean *neither to nor at* a place, but only *in a direction.* Thus "idhar" means "in this direction," "towards me;" "udhar" means "in that direction,"

Varia

'that way," "beyond;" "kidhar" means "in what direction?", *e.gr.* "we kidhar gaye?", "in what direction are they gone?"; and "jidhar" means "in the direction in which." The distinction between (*e.gr.*) "where" and "whither" in English is *not* observed in Hindustani; *e.gr.* "whither wentest thou, Gehazi?" is "ai Gehazī, tū kahāñ gayā thā?" In other words, "kahāñ" means "to what place" as well as "at what place"; and so with the other words in the column for "place." (4) In the fifth column, the words given denote *quantity* if in the *singular*, and *number* if in the *plural; e.gr.* "itnī nādānī," "so much folly (as this)"; "itne roz," "so many days (as these)." (5) In the sixth column, (*a*) the singular and plural equally denote quality, or kind; *e.gr.* "wah kaisā mūrkh hai," "what" (lit. "what sort of") "a fool he is!"; "jaise darakht haiñ, waise hī un ke phal bhī honge," "as the trees are, such will be their fruits," (*b*) the singular masculine, specially in its modified form, is used as an *adverb; e.gr.* "jaisā" (or "jaise") "us ne kahā thā, waisā" (or "waise") "hī us ne kiyā bhī hai," "as he said, so has he done." (*c*) The modified form of the singular masculine of the relative, as also the other form "jyoñ," are used to denote *degree; e.gr.* "jaise jaise" (or "jyoñ jyoñ") "un ko dukh diyā jātā thā, waise hī waise" (or "tyoñ hī tyoñ," or "woñ hī woñ") "we baṛhte gaye," "in proportion as they were afflicted, they went on multiplying."

4. Enough has now been said about the words in the three upper horizontal lines; but more will have to be said concerning Interrogatives, Relatives, and Indefinites.

5. "Kidhar hī" and "kaisā hī" occur in an indefinite sense only in the phrases "kidhar hī kyoñ na," "kaisā hī kyoñ na," "in whatever direction (it may

be)", "of whatever kind (it may be)". See Chapter XXVII, 4.

CHAPTER XXV.

Interrogative Words and Sentences.

1. With two exceptions, interrogative words cannot in Hindustani, as they do in English, come at the beginning of a sentence or clause. *E.gr.* we say "who are you?", but Hindustanis say "Tum kaun ho?"; we say "where is he gone?" but they say "wuh kahāñ gayā?" So, "āj tumhāre muñh kyoñ sūkhe haiñ?" "why are your faces dejected" (lit "dry") to-day?"

Place in a sentence

2. One of the two exceptions is this, that when "kyā" is a mere interrogative particle (*i.e.* taking the place of our "question-mark"), it *may sometimes* occupy the first place in a sentence; "kyā wuh dobāra apnī mā ke peṭ meñ dākhil hokar paidā ho saktā hai?', "can he, having re-entered his mother's womb, be born?" Here, if "kyā" had been postponed to its normal place, *viz.* just before the principal verb of the sentence (*viz.* "wuh dobāra apnī mā ke peṭ meñ dākhil hokar kyā paidā ho saktā hai?") the meaning would have been "though he re-enter his mother's womb, can he be born?" (see Chapter XV, section 14, 5). In short, the rule about the position of this interrogative particle is

Interrogative Particle

somewhat lax. Generally speaking, when it occupies the first place in a sentence, there is some special reason for it; but it would not be easy always to assign such special reason.

Special use of "Kahāñ"

3. The other exception is the use of a double "kahāñ" to express the utter unlikeness of two things (as we say "wide as the poles asunder"). In this case, each part of the question begins with "kahāñ." *E.gr.* "kahāñ Parameshwar kā anādi ananta jīwan? and kahāñ manushya kā thoṛe hī din ṭhahrnehārā janam?", "what comparison is there between the beginningless and endless life of God, and the life of a man which lasts only a few days?"; "kahāñ āp ke aparimeya gun? aur kahāñ merī chyūnṭī kī sī shakti?", "what is there in common between your boundless virtues, and my ant-like power?" In questions of this kind, if "kahāñ" were put in the place usual with interrogatives, it would be taken in its literal sense of "where," and the poetry would vanish.

"Yih" or "wuh" Inserted

4. With the interrogative words "kaun," "kyā," and "kaisā," "wuh" and "yih" are often added, and then the interrogative sentence includes in sense a relative clause which we express, but Hindustanis do not; *e.gr.* "Parameshwar ne yah ham se kyā kiyā?", "what is this which God has done to us?"; "tum logoñ ne yah kaisā kām kiyā hai?", "what sort of thing is this that you have done?"; "dekh, wuh kaun ā rahā hai?", "look, who is coming?" (lit. "who is that person who is coming?").

5. "Kyā", when repeated, *i.e.* when one "kyā"

"Kyā" Repeated

stands at the head of each of two or more words or clauses, loses its interrogative sense, and is translated by "both" and "and," or "whether" and "or"; *e.gr.* "kyā ghar meñ kyā maidān meñ us kā jo kuchh thā, sab par Yahowā kī āshīsh huī," "whatever he had, both in the house and in the field, Jehovah's blessing rested upon it;" "kyā mard kyā ʿaurat kyā bālbachche sab ke sab hāzir the," "men, women, and children, *all* were present." Care must be taken by foreigners not to confuse this use of "kyā" repeated with that of "chāhe" repeated (see Chapter XVI, section 10, 5); for both are translateable by "whether" and "or." But one difference between them is this, that in repeating "kyā" there is, at least at the time of speaking or writing, no doubt about the application, but a simple statement of fact; whereas in repeating "chāhe" there is always an element of doubt. Another difference is this, that "chāhe" requires to be followed by a verb, whereas "kyā" cannot govern one. Both these differences appear in the following example: "chāhe Isrāelī hoñ chāhe paradeshī we kyā strī kyā purush sab ke sab aisā kareñ," "whether they be Israelites or foreigners, they should all, men and women alike, do so." And this sentence, "turn such out of the camp, whether they be men or women," might be rendered *either* "aisoñ ko chāhe purush hoñ chāhe strī chhāwanī se nikāl do," *or* "kyā purush kyā strī aise sabhoñ ko chhāwanī se nikāl do;" but in the former case "hoñ" must be inserted, in the latter not.

Interrogative Repeated

6. In English, the force of an interrogative word is generally carried on into the next clause, *e.gr.* "why do you now keep quiet, and say nothing about bringing back the king?" But in Hindustani, it

such cases, the interrogative word must be repeated with the next clause; *e.gr.* "ab tum kyoñ chup rahte, and rājā ko lauṭā le āne kī charchā *kyoñ* nahīñ karte?"

Negative Meant

7. Hindustanis are fond of putting sentences into an interrogative form, when they do not mean to ask a question, but to express a negation strongly; *e.gr.* "ab rone kī kyā bāt hai?", "now what is there to cry about?", *i.e.* "there is *no* reason for crying." Hence a common phrase is "aur kyā?", lit. "what else?", where we should say "of course," *i.e.* "there can be no disputing what you say." This usage applies to all interrogative words, but most specially to "kahāñ;" *e.gr.* "jab wah āg kā īndhan hokar bhasma ho gaī hai tab kisī kām kī *kahāñ* rahī?", "when it has become the fuel of fire, and been burnt to ashes, of what use can it be?", lit. "*where* is it of any use?" Allied to this use of "kyā?" is the phrase "kyā jāne?" (lit. "what should one know?") or "kyā jāniye?" (lit. "what can be known?"), *i.e.* "*perhaps*."

Followed by "Balki"

8. "Kyā" is idiomatically used, followed by "balki" in Urdu, and "baran" in Hindi, as a strong way of saying "not only, but," when of the two things mentioned the former seems to be left far behind by the latter; *e.gr.* "sūar jo adhchirā kyā baran bilkul chire khurwālā bhī hai, par pāgur nahīñ kartā, is liye wah bhī tumhāre liye ashuddh hai," "the pig, because, though it is not half but (far beyond that) wholly cloven-footed, yet it does not chew the cud, therefore is unclean to you;" "Hindū log kyā, balki koī koī Masīhī bhī, aisī nādānī meñ phañse haiñ," "not only Hindus, but some Christians too are involved in such folly."

9. Hindustani has the very convenient power of *asking two question in one*, where we have to put one interrogative into another form. *E.gr.* if there are several persons, and we want to know how *each* of them is engaged, we have to say *either* "in what work is each of them engaged?", *or* "which of them is engaged in each kind of work?" but Hindustanis express this much more neatly, by saying "un meñ se kaun kaun kyā kyā karte haiñ?", or "kis kis kām meñ lage haiñ?" So, "kis kis ghaṛī meñ kitne kitne baje haiñ?", "what is it o'clock in each of the watches?"

Two questions in one

10. "Kaun" and "kyā" are, each of them, both nouns and adjectives; *i.e.* they can either stand alone, or be joined to a noun. When they stand alone, "kaun" refers always to persons, and means "who?", and "kyā" refers always to things, and means "what?". "Kyā" is not often used as an adjective; yet the phrase "kyā chīz?" is very common. But generally speaking, "kaun" answers to "which?" and "what?", when these are used adjectivally. *E.gr.* "wahāñ kaun ādmī khaṛā hai?", "what man is standing there?", *i.e.* "who is that man standing there?"; "kaun chiṛiyā bol rahī hai?", "what bird is making that sound?" As stated in Chap. IX, section 5, the adjectival affix "sā" is often added to "kaun" in this sense, without altering the meaning; perhaps, rather, to show clearly that "kaun" *is* used adjectivally; *e.gr.* "Āp kaun sī kitāb dekh rahe haiñ?", "what book are you reading?"

Both Nouns and Adjectives

11. Interrogatives, when followed by "hī," express astonishment, not question. We produce the same result by pronouncing the interrogative in a different

tone. *E.gr.* "Ahā, terī bhalāī kyā hī barī hai!", "Oh, how great is thy goodness!"; "Hāy, is laṛāī meñ kitne hī ādmī māre gaye haiñ!", "Alas, how many men have been killed in this war!"

Followed by "Hi"

12. The use of the interrogative particle is not always necessary in asking a question; for in speaking, the tone of the voice generally indicates that one is asking. But in writing, the cases are very rare when it is safe to omit it.

Interrogative Particle not always necessary

13. A *disjunctive* question is formed, as in English, by using a word for "or" between the parts. But besides the regular words for "or," *viz.* "yā" and "wā," "ki" (see Chap. XVIII, section 6, 1) is very often used; indeed, in Hindi it is *more* idiomatic than "wā;" specially if the second part of the question is a negation of the first. And the first part is, in Urdu, preferably but not necessarily, introduced by "āyā."

Disjunctive Question

CHAPTER XXVI.

Relative Words and Clauses.

1. Normally, in Hindustani sentences the relative comes first, and the correlative follows it. There is no more striking difference between the structure of sentences in Indian languages and in those in all languages West of India, than this (to Westerners) seeming inversion of the natural order of sentences. We have, however, isolated and partial instances of it in European languages; *e.gr.* "Qui s'excuse, s'accuse;' "what I know, I say." We call these "partial" instances, because, though the correlative is understood before "s'accuse" and "I say," it is *not expressed.* But in Hindustani it *is* expressed; and a foreign learner cannot have it too deeply impressed on his mind that *this* is the normal order. *E.gr.* "he who sins shall be punished" is *not* "wah jo pāp kare daṇḍ pāegā," but "jo pāp kare so daṇḍ pāegā;" "there are as many opinions as sages" (a common Hindu saying) is *not* "utne mat haiñ jitne muni haiñ," but "jitne muni haiñ utne mat bhī haiñ" (or, more tersely, "jai muni tai mat"); "he that is not with me is against me, and he that gathereth not with me scattereth" is *not* "wuh jo mere sāth nahīñ," etc., and "wuh jo mere sāth jamaʿ nahīñ kartā," etc., but "jo mere sāth nahīñ wuh merā mukhālif hai, and jo mere sāth jamaʿ nahīñ kartā wuh bakhertā hai." It is the more important for the foreign learner to observe this, because unhappily the first translators of the Bible into

Place of Relatives

Hindustani seem to have been ignorant of this rule; and as the Urdu Old Testament has not been revised, it abounds—specially in "Proverbs" and "Psalms"—with sentences beginning with a "wuh," followed by "jo." A single example of this must suffice. "Wuh, jis kā bharosā Khudāwand par hai, rahmat se gherā jātā hai," for "He, whose trust is on the Lord, is surrounded with mercy;" whereas it ought to be "jis kā bharosā Khudāwand par hai, wuh rahmat se gherā jātā hai."

2. At the same time, this order is only *normal*. Often there are good reasons for departing from it.

Exceptions

E.gr. Ps. 33: 17 is rightly translated "Khudāwand kī ānkh un par lagī hai jo us se ḍarte haiñ, and un par jo us kī rahmat ke ummedwār haiñ." Here, if it had been "jo Khudāwand se ḍarte haiñ, and jo us kī rahmat ke ummedwār haiñ, un par us kī ānkh lagī hai," it would indeed have been good Hindustani, but it would have somewhat shifted the balance of thoughts in the Psalmist's mind. And it would never have done to say "Khudāwand kī ānkh jo us se ḍarte haiñ," etc., because the "jo" would, at first hearing or reading, be taken to refer to "Khudāwand." Another example is "wuh bhalāī kartā, and un sab ko shifā detā phirā, jo Iblīs ke hāth se zulm uṭhāte the." Here, it would be *tolerable* to transpose the clauses "un sab ko shifā detā phirā" and "jo Iblīs ke hāth se zulm uṭhāte the;" but the above translation is better, because it brings nearer together the two participles, which depend equally on "phirā."

3. It may have been noticed, that in one of the above examples, the places of "Khudāwand" and "us" are transposed in one of the suggested alternatives, from what they are in English. This is because, in Hindustani, the noun *must* precede the pronoun which

refers to it; and therefore, in turning English into Hindustani, and putting the relative before the correlative, care must be taken to see that the noun goes with the relative, and the pronoun with the correlative. This rule has not been observed in the current Urdu translation of the third Commandment, "jo us kā nām befāida letā hai, Khudāwand use begunāh na ṭhahrāegā." Here, the translator was right, for once, in putting the relative clause first; but he forgot, in doing so, also to transpose the noun and the pronoun.

Places of Noun and Pronoun

4. Another reason for altering the normal order is to avoid a false inference which might be drawn from that order. *E.gr.* "us ne nazar kī roṭiyāñ khāīñ, jin kā khānā us ko rawā na thā," "he eat the shewbread, which it was not lawful for him to eat." Here, if it had been "jin nazar kī roṭiyoñ kā khānā us ko rawā na thā, un ko khāyā, it would have implied that *some* of the shewbread *was* lawful for him to eat, and his offence was that he ate, not it, but that part of it which was not lawful for him.

Avoidance of false inference

5. Hindustanis are fond of *repeating* relative words in a relative clause, where we use only one relative, and express the other in some other way, commonly by the use of an indefinite pronoun. *E.gr.* "jo jaisā kām kare so taisā phal bhoge" (a common Hindu saying), "whatever kind of work *any one* does, he will get a reward of that kind;" "jis jis prānī kā jo jo nām Ādam ne rakkhā, soī us kā nām paṛā," "whatever name Adam gave *any* creature, that came to be its name;" "jo chīz jis jagah ke munāsib ho, use usī jagah meñ

Relatives Reduplicated

rakkho," "put each thing in the place which is appropriate to it;" "jis ādmī ne jitnā kamāyā ho, utnā hī us ko milegā," "every man will receive just whatever he has earned;" "jo shaḵhs jis se maghlūb hai, wuh us kā ghulām hai," "a man is a slave of whoever has overcome him."

Effect of intervening Relative Clause

6. When a relative clause, not quite short, intervenes between a noun and some statement about the thing which the noun expresses, it is more idiomatic in Hindustani to put the noun in the unmodified form *without* a postposition, and to take it up after the relative clause by a non-relative pronoun *with* the postposition, if one is needed. *E.gr.* "Yahowā Parameshwar, jo sānjh ke samay bārī meñ phirtā thā, us ka shabda un ko sun paṛā," "the voice of Jehovah God, who was walking in the garden at eventide, was heard by them." This is better than "Yahowā Parameshwar kā shabda, jo.....phirtā thā, un ko sun paṛā." Again "Yeshū' Masīh Nāsarī, jis ko tum ne salīb diī aur Ḵhudā ne murdoñ meñ se jilāyā, usī ke nām se," etc., "only by the name of Jesus Christ the Nazarene, whom you crucified and God raised from the dead," etc., rather than "Yeshū' Masīh Nāsarī hī ke nām se, jis ko," etc. So: "Kurnelius sūbedār, jo ḵhudātars aur rāstbāz ādmī.....hai, us ne pāk firishte se hidāyat pāī," "Cornelius the centurion, who is a pious and righteous man, has received an instruction from a holy angel," instead of "Kurnelius sūbedār ne, jo. .....hai, pāk firishte se," etc. Once more: "apnī prajā ke log jo Misr meñ haiñ un ke dukh ko maiñ ne nishchay dekhā hai," "surely I have seen the suffering of my people who are in Egypt;" and not "apnī prajā ke logoñ ke dukh ko, jo Misr meñ haiñ, maiñ ne," etc.

7. The above are instances of relative clauses which do *not* precede correlative ones; and they are instances in which the relative could not have been dispensed with. But now it must be said, that Hindustani is not fond of such relative clauses at all. Where such clauses precede the correlatives, there it likes them; but where they follow them, though very often indeed Hindustani cannot avoid them, yet, wherever it can, it substitutes for them some other construction. And this is specially necessary when one relative clause is included in another; which makes an involved sentence such as Hindustani specially abhors. Hence, it often turns the verb of such a relative clause into a participle of that verb, and makes it precede, and agree with, the correlative; and it joins the subject of the relative clause with that participle by adding to it the adjectival affix "kā" ("kī," "ke"). *E.gr.* "log bīmāroñ aur nāpāk rūhoñ ke satāe huoñ ko lāe," "people brought the sick, and those who were vexed by unclean spirits," which is better than "bīmāroñ, aur jinheñ nāpāk rūheñ satātī thīñ, unheñ bhī lāe." So, "pitā aur us ke ghar meñ rahtī huī kuñwārī beṭī ke bīch," "between a father and a virgin daughter living in his house," rather than "pitā aur us kī kuñwārī beṭī ke bīch, jo us ke ghar meñ rahtī ho." Again, "un kī thāpī huī mūratoñ ko tor ḍālo, aur un kī banāī huī vediyoñ ko ḍhā do," "break in pieces the images which they have set up, and demolish the altars that they have made." The insertion of the past participle of "honā," in all such cases, at least as the general rule, has been explained in Chapter XV, section 2, 2.

Substitutes for Relative Clauses

8. Often the meaning of the relative clause is given by the simple use of the adjectival affix aforesaid

without even a participle; *e.gr.* "jitne Khudā ke kalām meñ ke hukm ke khilāf jore jāte haiñ," "as many as are joined together contrarily to the command in God's word." Here, the English is even more concise than the Hindustani; for it has no word answering to "ke," But this word the Hindustani *must* retain; though it *may* omit the "meñ," which the English keeps. Anyhow, in both languages there is a suppressed relative clause; "the command which is written in God's word" would be the full English, and "us hukm ke khilāf jo Khudā ke kalām meñ likhā hai" would be the full, but clumsy and bad, Hindustani. A similar example is: "us ne mujhe apne man ke sāre bhed batāe," "he told me all the secrets of his mind," *i.e.* "all the secrets, *which were in* his mind."

Suppression of Relative

9. When following relative clauses, referring to the same object, occur in English, in all after the first Hindustani drops the relative, and adopts the demonstrative pronoun. *E.gr.* in English we say "the labourers *who* have reaped your fields, *and whose* hire you have kept back;" but this is, in Hindustani, not "jin mazdūroñ ne tumhāre khet kāṭe, aur *jin* kī mazdūrī tum ne rakh chhoṛī," which would suggest, if it would not necessarily mean, that those who had reaped their fields, and those whose hire they had kept back, were different persons. Instead of this, it should be "jin mazdūroñ ne tumhāre khet kāṭe, aur *un* kī mazdūrī tum ne rakh chhoṛī." So, for "besides that foundation which has been laid, and *which* is Jesus Christ, no one can lay another" is "siwā us neo ke jo paṛī huī hai, aur *wuh* Yeshū' Masīh hai, koī shakhs dūsrā nahīñ rakh saktā." So again, "jin manushyoñ ko Mūsā ne desh ke bhed

Relative not Repeated

lene ke liye bhejā thā, aur *unhoñ* ne lauṭkar us desh kī nindā kii thī," "the men whom Moses had sent to spy out the land, and *who* had returned and defamed that land."

Support for the Relative

10. When a relative clause has to follow the noun on which it depends, Hindustani idiom prefers, if it does not absolutely require, a "wuh" or an "aisā" before the noun, to form a sort of support to the relative. *E.gr.* "tāki aisī rūhānī qurbānīāñ charhāo, jo Khudā ke nazdīk maqbūl hotī haiñ," "so that you may offer spiritual sacrifices which are acceptable to God;" "tum aisī ummat ho jo Khudā kī khāss milkiyat hai," "you are the people which is God's special property;" "wuh tujh se aisī bāteñ kahegā jin se tū najāt pāegā" "he will tell thee things whereby thou shalt be saved." In all such instances the English requires no word before the noun, no support for the relative; but the Hindustani runs much more smoothly with one than without one.

Not absolute

Yet this rule applies only to those cases, in which the meaning, or at least the implication, is that there are *other* things, to which the noun by itself would apply, but to which the relative clause does *not* apply. *E.gr.* the above three examples imply that there are spiritual sacrifices which are not acceptable to God; that there are other peoples, which are not God's special property; and that he *might* possibly say things which would *not* lead to salvation. Otherwise, where there is no such implication, "aisā" or "wuh" must *not* be inserted. *E.gr.* "yih be'aql jānwaroñ kī mānind haiñ, jo pakṛe jāne aur halāk hone ke liye paidā hue haiñ," "these are like brute beasts, which

are born to be caught and destroyed." Here, the insertion of "un" or "aisā" before "be'aql jānwaroñ" would imply that there are some brute beasts which are born with a *different* end in view.

With "All"

11. "All who" and "all that" must not be rendered into Hindustani by "sab jo," but by "jitne" and "jo kuchh." *E.gr.* "all who seek shall find" is not "sab jo ḍhūñḍte haiñ, pāeñge," but "jitne ḍhūñḍte haiñ, pāenge." "Remember all that I say to you" is not "wuh sab yād rakkho, jo maiñ tum se kahūñ," but "jo kuchh maiñ tum se kahūñ, use yād rakkho." There is no need, in such cases, for "jitnā" to be followed by "utnā."

"Jo" as Conjunction

12. (1) There is a peculiar use of "jo" which is a stumbling block to European beginners, and all the more so because there is no English word which exactly corresponds to it; though "whereas," "inasmuch as," "in that," etc., are often helpful for this purpose. It differs from other uses of "jo," in that whereas in them it qualifies a *word* (expressed or understood), here it qualifies, and introduces, a *whole clause;* and the following correlative refers to the whole clause. *E.gr.* "tū ne *jo* apnī strī kī sunī, aur jis vriksh ke phal ke vishay maiñ ne tujhe āgyā dii ki tū use na khānā, us ko tū ne khāyā hai, is liye," etc., "inasmuch as thou hearkenedst to thy wife, and atest the fruit of the tree which I commanded thee not to eat, therefore," etc. "Tum *jo* ab loñ īnṭeñ banāne ke liye logoñ ko puāl diyā karte the, so āge ko na denā," "whereas you have been hitherto giving the people straw to make bricks, in future do not give it." "Tum log jo gariyār ho, is kāran maiñ tumhāre bich hoke na chalūngā,"

"because you are stiffnecked, therefore I will not travel in the midst of you." "Tum ne jo mujhe yahāñ bech ḍālā, is se udās mat ho," "do not be grieved at having sold me hither." "Tū ne jo mere pati ko le liyā, so kyā chhoṭī bāt hai?", "is it a small thing that thou hast taken away my husband?"

(2) But while this use of "jo" is perfectly idiomatic, it must be added that, in general, it is far more common in Hindi than in Urdu—in Urdu, the relative clause is generally introduced with "chūnki"—and that even in Hindi, it is obsolescent. And what makes this possible is the fact, that it is not really necessary to complete the sense. In other words, the connexion between the relative and the correlative clauses is *understood without the relative particle* ("jo") being expressed. *E.gr.* as in English one may equally well say "you have been a good friend to me, so I will not now leave you in your trouble," and "*Because* you have been a good friend to me, *therefore* I," etc; so in Hindustani one might say to a hireling, at the close of the day, *either* "tum ne *jo* āj bharī mihnat kiī haī, is liye maiñ tumhārī mazdūrī meñ kuchh baṛhāke dūngā," *or* the same sentence with the omission of "jo."

Generally omitted

(3) But this sentence well illustrates the point, which beginners cannot have too deeply impressed on their minds, that in all such sentences, whereas we prefer to state the conclusion first, and give the reason for it afterwards, the Indian mind works in the opposite direction. An English employer, if he was disposed to reward extra diligence on the part of an employé, would naturally say "Now I am going to give you something additional, because you worked so hard." But the Indian mind puts the cause or reason first, and the conclusion from it second;

Cause before effect

the thing referred to first, and the reference to it afterwards. Hence those Indians who speak English, but with an imperfect knowledge of its idiom, will say "yesterday it was raining, therefore I could not come to you;" whereas an Englishman would naturally say "I could not come yesterday, for it was raining."

Relative only of third person

13. In Hindustani, relative words are considered to belong of the third person; sparingly to the first, and never to the second. This rule is specially noticeable in the vocative; *e.gr.* where we freely say, "O God, *who* hearest prayer," "come unto me, all *ye that* labour," and so on; Hindustanis *cannot* say "Ai Khudā, jo duʿā suntā hai," "he jitne parishram karte ho, mere pās āo;" but *either* "Ai Khudā, *tū jo* duʿā suntā hai," "*tum sab* jo parishram karte ho, mere pās āo," *or* (better) "ai duʿā ke sunnewāle Khudā," "he sab parishram karnewālo, mere pās āo." It is difficult to say *why* the insertion of the personal pronoun should make all this difference; why, *e.gr.* "ai hamāre Bāp jo āsmān par hai" is bad Hindustani, and "ai hamāre Bāp, Tū jo āsmān par hai," is good; but there is no doubt of the *fact*; and it is *possible* that, if we could read the subconscious mind of the native, we should discover that, in saying "ai hamāre Bāp Tū jo āsmān par hai," he is really saying "O our Father, *whereas* thou art in heaven." In other words, possibly this is really an instance of the use of "jo" which is explained in the last section. For *this* "jo" *can never* stand first in its clause; it must have *at least one* word before it in the clause.

14. "Jo" is often used in the sense of "if," and "when;" in each case followed by "to" as its correla-

tive. But this use is rather to be avoided, seeing that it tends to ambiguity, and there are other words for "if" and "when." Still, it is well to know that "jo" *is* thus used.

"Jo" as "If"

15. There is a use of the relative, very idiomatic in Latin, and thence specially appearing in the English translation of the "Acts," which refers so much to Roman administration. It stands at the beginning of what is either a new sentence, or at least is logically a new sentence, because, though perhaps not separated from the preceding by a full-stop, yet it makes a new statement; and it refers to some person or thing mentioned in that preceding sentence. *E.gr.* "These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also; *whom* Jason hath received;" "we found this man.....a ring-leader of the sect of the Nazarenes; *who* moreover assayed to profane the temple; on *whom* also we laid hold; from *whom* thou wilt be able," etc. In this last sentence there are *three* "who"s, each introducing an entirely new statement about St. Paul. In *all such cases* Hindustani does *not* retain the relative, but turns it into the simple personal pronoun, "wuh," "us par," "us se."

16. There are certain uses of the relative, which strictly speaking are *misuses*, yet are in Urdu considered good. (1) One is the substitution of "jab" for "tab," which, as we have said, is abhorred in the Delhi idiom. *E.gr.* "us ne yih bāt *jabhī* kahī, jab maiñ us ke pās thā," "he said this thing *then*, when I was with him." (2) Another is putting "jaisā" for the simple affix "sā," *e.gr.* "mujh jaisā ādmī," "a man like me," instead of "mujh sā ādmī."

17. The relative and the simple third person of

"Quality or Manner" are put together with a special meaning. "Jyoñ tyoñ karke," or "joñ toñ karke," or "jaise taise" (or "waise") "karke" means "somehow or other," "with difficulty."

CHAPTER XXVII

Indefinite Words.

Differences from English

1. The English language has *two* words with indefinite meaning, *viz.* "some" and "any;" but Hindustani does not make this distinction; the same word translates both. Another difference between the two languages is this, that when the indefinite is negative, the English combines the negative with the indefinite word, *e.gr.* "nobody," "nothing," "never," "nowhere," "no-how;" but Hindustani keeps them separate, *e.gr.* "koī nahīñ," "kuchh nahīñ," "kabhī nahīñ," "kahīñ nahīñ," "kisī tarah nahīñ."

Plural how Formed

2. When it is desired to make an indefinite plural, this is done by reduplicating it; *e.gr.* "koī koī," "some people;" "kuchh kuchh," "some few" or "some little" (with plural noun); "kabhī kabhī," "sometimes;" "kahīñ kahīñ," "in some place," "here and there." These indefinite reduplicated words may be separated by any number of

intervening words; *e.gr.* "kisī ne kuchh kahā aur kisī ne kuchh," "some said one thing and some another.' See Chap. XXXIX, 3.

3. When the English adds "or other" to an indefinite word, to express the fact that we are ignorant of the individuality of what we are speaking of, "na" is inserted between the two occurrences of the indefinite word; *e.gr.* "koī na koī," "somebody or other;" "kuchh na kuchh," "something or other;" "kabhī na kabhī," "at some time or other;" "kahīñ na kahīñ," "somewhere or other." But when we know the individual, but do not wish to name him or it, *i.e.* when we say in English "such," or "such and such," the Urdu word for this is "falāñ," of both numbers. In Hindi a corruption of this word, *viz.* "phalānā," is generally used; but in high language the Sanskrit "amuk" is employed.

—"Or Other"

4. When by "any" we mean "any you like," or "any whatever it may be," Hindustanis add to the indefinite word, in the same clause but not necessarily immediately, "kyūñ na ho," which literally means "how should it not be?" *E.gr.* "koī kyūñ na ho," "anybody (no matter who he is);" "kahīñ kyūñ na ho," "anywhere (no matter where it is)." When "kuchh" is employed in this way, "hī" is added to it; *e.gr.* "pāp kuchh hī kyūñ na ho, us kā phal burā hotā hai," "the fruit of *any* kind of sin is evil." And the same "hī" is added, in this connexion, to interrogative words which do not otherwise admit of indefinites being formed from them; *e.gr.* "kaisā hī ādmi kyūñ na ho," "*any* sort of man (no matter what sort"); "kitne hī log kyūñ na ekaṭṭhe hoñ," "however many people may come together;" "wuh kidhar hī

"Any you like"

kyūñ na jātā ho," "in whatever direction he may be going." (See Chap. XXIV, 1 (4).) At the same time, English indefinites of this sort are more often expressed in Hindustani by "sab" than they are in English by "all" or "everything." *E.gr.* "he can eat anything" would be more idiomatically rendered by "wuh sab kuchh khā saktā hai" than by "chīz kuchh hī kyūñ na ho, wuh use khā saktā hai."

5. When a relative is indefinite, like "whoever," "whatever," "whenever," "wherever," this is expressed in Hindustani *either* by doubling the relative, *e.gr.* "jo jo," "jab jab," "jahāñ jahāñ;" *or* by adding the indefinite to the relative, *e.gr.* "jo koī," "jo kuchh," "jab kabhī," "jahāñ kahīñ."

Indefinite Relative

6. To intensify the indefiniteness of a word in a negative statement, "bhī" may be added; *e.gr.* "koī bhī nahīñ," "no one whatever;" "kuchh bhī nahīñ," "nothing whatsoever;" "kahīñ bhī nahīñ," "nowhere at all."

Addition of "Bhī"

7. "Koī" is used also adverbially, along with numbers, in the sense of "about;" *e.gr.* "koī chār baje," "about four o'clock;" "koī derh sau ādmī," "about 150 people." In this sense, it is not declined, either in number or in case.

= "About"

8. When "koī" and "kuchh" are used alone, *i.e.* as substantives, "koī" refers only to a person, and "kuchh" only to a thing; but when used adjectivally, this distinction does not hold. *E.gr.* "koī chīz" is quite as good as "koī

"Koi" and "Kuchh"

ādmī;" and "kuchh log" quite as good as "kuchh roṭī." But the difference between "koī" and "kuchh," when used as adjectives, is this: that "koī" can be used only of individual things, whether singular or plural, *not* of a *collective* object; and for this last only "kuchh" can be used. *E.gr.* "roṭī" has two meanings, "bread" (collectively) and "a loaf;" hence while "some bread" is in Hindustani "kuchh roṭī," "any loaf" is "koī roṭī."

9. Often it is better to use "koī" than "ek," though "one" is quite right in English. *E.gr.* a lady, who was being taught in her zanāna by an English missionary, when she came to Gen. 3: 22, "Behold, the man is become as one of us," would not be satisfied without her teacher telling her *which* Person of the Trinity Adam had become like. But when "ham meñ se kisī" was substituted for "ham meñ se ek," her doubts vanished; for she felt that the indefinite left the identity uncertain, whereas "ek" must refer to some particular one.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Negative Words and Clauses.

"Na" the Regular Negative

1. The proper negative particle in Hindustani is "na." No other is rightly used, except for some special reason. Foreign beginners should specially take a note of this, as the common idea among English

people is that "nahīñ" is the normal negative particle; whereas "nahīñ" is really a compound word, made up of "na" and some form of the present of the substantive verb ("hai," "haiñ," "ho," "hūñ"). Hence "nahīñ" is correctly used:—

Where "Nahiñ" is right

(1) With the present and perfect tenses; because these tenses, without the negative, are formed with the help of the substantive verb in the present tense. Hence, when they are negative, they dispense with that verb at the end as a separate word, and join it with "na" in the word "nahīñ" *before* the other verb. *E.gr.* "I am going" is "Maiñ jātā hūñ;" but "I am not going" is neither "maiñ na jātā hūñ" nor "maiñ nahīñ jātā hūñ," but "maiñ nahīñ jātā." It is, indeed, very common to hear even natives say "maiñ nahīñ jātā hūñ;" but the "hūñ" is superfluous, having already occurred in "nahīñ;" and is therefore wrong. Similarly, "I have heard" is "maiñ ne sunā hai;" but "I have not heard" is neither "maiñ ne na sunā hai" nor "maiñ ne nahīñ sunā hai," but "maiñ ne nahīñ sunā." In both these cases the use of "nahīñ" is necessary to distinguish these tenses from others; *e.gr.* "maiñ na jātā" would mean "I would not have gone" ("unrealisable conditional"); and "maiñ ne na sunā" would mean "I did not hear" (simple past). But this is not the mistake to which foreigners are more prone (indeed, foreigners do not make sufficient use of "na"); but rather the addition of the substantive verb where "nahīñ" has already occurred.

Exceptions

Yet there is an exception to the above rule; *viz.* where the substantive verb itself, in the present, is negatived. Hindustanis do not say "na hai" for "is not," but "nahīñ hai." However, the cause of this is simply euphony; they feel that "hai" is such a short

word, that a somewhat longer word than "na" should accompany it. But this may be called an "exception which proves the rule." And very often indeed the "hai" is omitted, and "nahīñ" alone stands for "is not," as it should do. *E.gr.* "mujh par badrūh nahīñ," "I have not a devil," lit. "a devil *is not* on me."

(2) As the negative answer to a question, whether it stands alone (as "no" usually does), or introduces a denial, *e.gr.* "nahīñ, maiñ aisā ādmī nahīñ hūñ," "No, I am not such a person." This is because "no" really means more than "not," *i.e.* it means "it is not so," or something to that effect; and that is just what "nahīñ" means.

(3) At the end of a clause, *e.gr.* "yih nahīñ," "not this;" "marūngā nahīñ," "I *shall not* (emphatically) die." In this last example, the ordinary form would be "maiñ na marūngā," for as a rule the negative particle comes before the verb, and then the future takes "na" and not "nahīñ;" but when, for emphasis' sake, the order is reversed, then the negative must be not "na," but "nahīñ." Probably the thought in the Indian's subconscious mind is what might be expressed in English thus: "I shall die? no, not so." Similarly, "tum sone rūpe se nahīñ, balki khūn se kharīde gaye," "you were bought, not with gold and silver, but with blood." So, if a servant or pupil is blamed for not mentioning something the day before, he may well answer, "Āp the nahīñ," "you were not (here)," which is much more forcible than "āp na the." And "hai nahīñ" is much more forcible than "nahīñ hai," or simply "nahīñ," in the sense of "it does not exist," "there is no such thing."

2. Another negative particle is "mat;" but its use is extremely limited. It has been entirely banished from good Urdu; it is confined to the Imperative, and in that to the second person; it may never be

used to an equal or superior person, but only to an inferior, in other words it can be used only in a command, never in a petition; and, lastly, there is no necessity for using it at all, for "na" conveys all its meaning.

"Mat" Obsolescent

3. "Na," then, is the proper negative particle for the Imperfect, the simple Past, the Pluperfect, the Future, the Subjunctive, the Conditional, the Infinitive, and all the three kinds of Participle; also for the Imperative in the first and third persons, the second person when it means a petition, and in good Urdu even when it means a command. It is true that "nahīñ" is often used with the Imperfect, the Pluperfect, and the future; and therefore its use with them does not sound so bad as with the other tenses in the above list; but it is incorrect nevertheless, for the "hīñ" part of the word is idle. The rule, that the negative proper to the infinitive is "na," extends also to words formed by adding "wālā" to the infinitive; *e.gr.* "Masīh ke na mānnewāle," "those who do not acknowledge Christ."

"Na" with what Tenses

4. To express "neither.....nor," the *best* usage is "na to" for the first negative particle, "aur na" for the second, and simply "na" for the remaining (if any). *E.gr.* "jo kuchh terā hai, us meñ se na to ek sūt, and na jūtī kī bandhanī na koī âur vastu lūngā," "I will take of what is thine neither a single thread, nor a shoe-lace, nor anything else;" "na to us se pahile aisī tiḍḍiyāñ āī thīñ, aur na un ke pīchhe aisī phir āengī," "neither had such locusts come before then, nor will such come again after them;"

"Neither...Nor"

"tīn din loñ na to kisī ne kisī ko dekhā, aur na koī apne sthān se uṭhā," "for three days neither did any one see any one else, nor did anybody rise from his place." But usage in this matter is anything but strict; and very often we find simply "na.....na" as the equivalent of "neither.....nor."

Place of Verb

In this connexion it should be mentioned that when there is but one verb for the two clauses which respectively begin with "neither" and "nor," it is quite idiomatic, and indeed better, to put it only in the former clause, so that the sentence (contrary to the ordinary rule) ends without a verb. *E.gr.* "tum na to un se bāchā bāndho, aur na un ke dewatāoñ se," "neither make a covenant with them, nor with their gods;" "na to Yahūdīoñ kī ṭhokar ke bā'is bano, aur na Yūnānīoñ, na Khudā kī Kalīsiyā kī," "Be occasions of stumbling neither to the Jews, nor to the Greeks, nor yet to the Church of God."

"Na" in Fear and Doubt

5. Verbs signifying fear, doubt, and similar feelings require, in Hindustani, that the other verb, which depends on the former, have a "na" attached to it; *e.gr.* "lānewāle ḍarte the, ki log ham ko sangsār na kar deñ," "they who brought them were afraid of being stoned by the people;" "mujhe baṛā sandeh hai ki yah vastu kahīñ nikammī na niklegī," "I greatly doubt that this thing will turn out useless." This last is a good example for the idiomatic insertion of "kahīñ" in such sentences, without any *conscious* meaning of "anywhere." And often with "kahīñ," "aisā na ho ki" is added; *e.gr.* "maiñ ḍartā hūñ, kahīñ aisā na ho ki tumhāre khayālāt khulūs aur pākdāmanī se badal jāeñ," "I fear, lest your thoughts be altered from simplicity and chastity." Often, again, "kahīñ" is dropped, and

"aisā na ho ki," or even simply "na ho ki," occurs in the same sense.

"Lest"

6. The last example given above illustrates the fact that "lest" (which is equivalent to "so that not") is rendered by one or other of the phrases just given. And this applies not only to statements about fear, doubt, etc., but also where there is no such thought expressed. *E.gr.* "maiñ pahāṛ par bhāg nahīñ saktā, kahīñ aisā na ho ki mar jāūñ," "I cannot flee to the mountain, lest I die;" "in dushṭ manushyoñ ke ḍeroñ ke pās se haṭ jāo, na ho ki tum bhī in ke sab pāpoñ meñ phañske miṭ jāo," "get away from near the tents of these wicked men, lest you also, being entangled in all their sins, perish;" "aisā na ho ki ham bhūl jāeñ," "lest we forget."

A Caution

7. On the other hand, there are cases where we say "lest," but do not really mean "in order that not," because we do not mean that there is any doubt of the event following the action just mentioned, but rather that it will infallibly follow it. In *such* cases, "lest" is not rightly rendered by any of the above phrases, but by "nahīñ to," or (in Urdu) "warna." *E.gr.* when God said to Adam, "do not eat it, lest thou die," He meant what would be less equivocally expressed by "do not eat it, *else* thou *wilt* die;" and so the Hindustani is "use na khānā, *nahīñ to tū mar jāegā.*"

Negative Interrogation

8. Hindustanis are fond of putting a positive assertion into the form of a negative interrogation. Where we say "of course" as the decided answer to a question, they generally say "aur kyā?", "what else?"; but often "kyūñ nahīñ?",

"why not?" And this use of the negative occurs also in sentences which contain the "a fortiori" argument, *i.e.* proving the more credible from the less credible; *e.gr.* "dekho, mere jīte aur sang rahte bhī tum Yahowā se balwā karte āe ho, to mere marne ke pīchhe kyoñ na karoge?", "see, even during my lifetime, and presence with you, you have been rebelling against Jehovah, then how much more will you do so" (lit. why should you not do so) "after my death?"

At end of Statement

9. "Na" is used by itself, with an elevation of the voice as in a question, at the end of a statement, something like our "eh?" (We do not often add "is it not so?" to a statement, but the French say "n'est ce pas?", and the Germans "nicht wahr?" in similar cases.) *E.gr.* "is khet meñ sirf gehūñ hī boyā huā hai, na?" "I suppose there is only wheat sown in this field, eh?"; "yahāñ tumhāre sang Yahowā kā koī upāsak to nahīñ hai, kewal Bāl hī ke upāsak haiñ, na?", "here with you are no worshippers of Jehovah, are there? only worshippers of Baal, eh?" Yet, forasmuch as it is impossible to represent intonations in writing or print, this use of "na" should be almost limited to speech with the voice; but in the latter it is a very useful usage.

"Na" between repeated words

10. We have already mentioned the use of "na" between two occurrences of the same indefinite word, *e.gr.* "koī na koī," "some one or other"; which form seems to have originally been "koī na ho, to aur koī hogā," "should it not be some one, then it will be some one else." This seems to account for a similar insertion of "na" between two occurrences of the same participle; *e.gr.* "we chhat par kī ghās ke samān hoñ, jo *baṛhte na baṛhte*

sūkh jātī hai," "let them be like the grass on the housetops, which withers before it be grown up," lit. which while growing, yet not growing, withers;" *i.e.* it tries to grow, but cannot accomplish it.

CHAPTER XXIX.

The Word "Whether."

1. The *adverb* "whether" has already been treated; see Chapter XVI, section 10, 5.

2. In *direct* interrogations, "whether," as the particle introducing the former of two alternatives, is in Urdu "āyā," and in Hindi (and often in Urdu also) "kyā." *E.gr.* "āyā Yūhannā kā baptismā āsmān kī taraf se thā, yā insān kī taraf se?", "was John's baptism from heaven, or from man?"; "kyā tum wahāñ se āj āe ho, yā kal āe the?", "are you come from there to-day, or did you come yesterday?"; "āsān kyā hai, yih kahnā ki tere gunāh mu'āf hue, yā yih, ki uṭh aur chal?", "which is easier, to say thy sins are forgiven, or Rise and walk?"

Direct Interrogation

3. In *indirect* interrogations "whether" is rendered by "ki," and the "or not," which in English may be omitted, in Hindustani *must* be expressed, and that by "ki

Indirect Interrogation

nahīñ" or (in Urdu) by "yā nahīñ." *E.gr.* "Mujhe likhiye, ki āp mujhe agle Sanīchar ko utār sakenge ki nahīñ," "write me whether you will be able to put me up next Saturday;" "wah purush sochtā thā ki Yahowā ne merī yātrā ko suphal kiyā hai ki nahīñ," "that man was considering whether Jehovah had made his journey prosperous." And English learners should carefully remember that, while we often substitute "if" for "whether" in such a case, yet this must *never* be rendered by any Hindustani word for "if" (*e.gr.* "agar," "yadi"), which in fact is meaningless in such a connexion. *E.gr.* "tell me if you can do this work" is "mujh se kaho ki tum yih kām kar sakte ho yā nahīñ:" "he asked me if I was 50 years old" is "us ne mujh se pūchhā ki tum pachās baras ke ho gaye ho, ki nahīñ."

CHAPTER XXX.

The Words "Enough" and "Too" and "Too Much."

No equivalents

1. These words are really *comparative* in meaning, "enough" signifying "*as much* as is good" (in whatever sense "good" is meant), and "too" or "too much" meaning "*more than* is desired, or desirable." Consequently, there is in ordinary Hindustani no special word to express either of these thoughts; for we saw, under "Comparison of

Adjectives" (Chapter VI, 2), how the Indian Vernaculars have lost the idea of comparison as a distinct idea. We have said "*ordinary* Hindustani," for somewhat high Urdu freely uses the Arabic word "kāfī" for "enough" as an adjective, and very high Hindi uses the Sanskrit word "yatheshṭa," which literally means "as desired," in the same sense. *E.gr.* "shāgird ke liye yih kāfī hai, ki apne ustād kī mānind ho," "it is enough for a disciple that he be like his master."

"Enough" as Adjective

2. But in ordinary Hindustani "enough" is generally expressed by "bahut," "itnā hī bahut," or some similar phrase. *E.gr.* "tū kyoñ aisā kare? itnā hī bahut hai ki mere prabhu kī anugrah kī drishṭi mujh par banī rahe," "why shouldest thou do so? it is enough that my lord's gracious regard remain fixed upon me;" "dekh, yahāñ do talwāreñ haiñ. Us ne kahā, Bahut haiñ," "see, here are two swords. He said, They are enough;" "kyā yih mez itne hī meñ banegī?", "is this (money) enough to make this table?"

"Bas"

3. "Bas" in *Persian* is an adjective meaning "enough;" but in *Hindustani* it is exclusively used as an *interjection*, "enough!" It is a mistake to say "yih mere liye bas hai," for "this is enough for me;" it should be, as above, "yih mere liye bahut hai." Yet "bas" is also used, as a kind of noun, in the phrase "bas karo," "stop that!"

As Adverb

4. When "enough" is an *adverb*, it must be rendered by more or less of a circumlocution. *E.gr.* "I am not rich enough to build a bridge over this river," "Mere pās itnā rupaiyā nahīñ, ki is nadī par

pul banwāūñ;" "he is strong enough to overcome even that giant," "wuh itnā zorāwar hai, ki us pahlawān ko bhī jīte;" "this water is hot enough to boil an egg," "yih pānī aṇḍā pakāne ke lāiq garm hai."

5. "Too" and "too much" may also be expressed by a circumlocution. *E.gr.* "the burden is too heavy for me to bear," "yih bojh mere sahne se bāhar hai," or "yih bojh itnā bhārī hai, ki mujh se sahā nahīñ jātā;" "he eats too much," "jitnā chāhiye, us se wuh ziyāda" (or "adhik") "khāyā kartā hai;" "he drives his cattle too hard," "wuh apne gāy bailoñ ko ziyāda" (or "hadd se ziyāda") "zor se hānktā hai." But very often these words are sufficiently represented in Hindustani by "bahut," pronounced with a peculiar intonation. With one kind of intonation, one conveying satisfaction, "bahut" means "enough;" with another, conveying a slight degree of dissatisfaction, the same word implies "too" or "too much." And with this latter kind of intonation, "ziyāda" and "adhik" have, perhaps with more reason than "bahut," the same meaning.

"Too"

CHAPTER XXXI.

INTERJECTIONS.

Only a little need be said of these.

1. "He" (Hindi) and "ai" (Urdu) are those most commonly used in addressing a person; indeed, it is very seldom, much more seldom than in English, that a person is addressed simply in the vocative, without such an interjection. Hence, whereas we begin our prayers indifferently with "Lord" and "O Lord," they should in Hindustani always begin with "He Prabhu" or "ai Khudāwand." On the other hand, no interjection is required, or even tolerated, before a personal pronoun; *e.gr.* "O thou Hearer of prayer" must not be rendered "Ai tū duʿā kē sunnewāle," but either simply "ai duʿā ke sunnewāle," or "Tū jo duʿā sunā kartā hai;" "Come unto me, all ye that labour" must not be rendered "he tum sab parishram karnewālo," but either "he sab parishram karnewālo," or "tum jo parishram karte ho, sab mere pās āo." (See Chap. XXVI, 13).

"He" and "Ai"

2. "He" and "ai" are *repeated* before two or more designations of the *same* person or thing addressed; where the foreign learner is apt at first to think that two or more persons or things are addressed. *E.gr.* "My Lord, and my God!" is "ai mere Khudāwand! ai mere Khudā!"; "He Yaru-

The same Repeated

shalem! he nabīoñ ke ghāt karnewāle! he apne pās bheje huoñ ke pattharāw karnewāle!", "O Jerusalem, thou slayer of the prophets, and stoner of them who are sent to thee!" (See Chap. XXXV, 6).

3. "Re" is used in addressing a person, but *with contempt.* "Get thee behind me, Satan" is "re Shaitān, mere sāmhne se jāo;" "O thou slothful and good-for-nothing servant" is "re ālasī aur nikamme naukar."

"Re"

4. "Are" expresses indignant astonishment at something that has just been said, and is followed by a very slight pause—such as would be indicated in English by a comma—before the speaker proceeds. *E.gr.* "Are, tum mujh se aisī bāt kyūnkar kah sakte ho?", "How can you say such a thing to me?" (there is no word in English which exactly represents "are;" we express its meaning by our tone); "Are, maiñ kyā hūñ, ki aisā barā kām karūñ?", "who am *I*, that I should do such a great thing?"

"Are"

5. A single "wāh!" signifies astonishment without indignation, but rather accompanied with pleasure. *E.gr.* "Wāh! terī bhalāī kyā hī barī hai!", "Oh! how great is thy goodness!"; "Wāh! Khudā kī daulat aur hikmat aur ʿilm kyā hī ʿamīq hai!", "O the depth of the wealth and wisdom and knowledge of God!"

"Wāh"

6. A doubled "wāh" signifies approval, without any addition of surprise.

7. "Hāy," whether single or doubled (the latter more common), means "alās!", "what a pity!" But

"Hāy"

when a single "hāy" is connected with a noun by the postposition "par," it signifies "woe!" *E.gr.* "He Pārīshiyo aur Shāstriyo, tum par hāy!", "Woe unto you, Pharisees and Scribes!", "Ṭhokaroñ ke kāran jagat par hāy!", "Woe to the world because of stumbling-blocks!"

8. "Shābāsh"—which is contracted from two Persian words, "shād," "glad," and "bāsh," "be thou"—means "well done," "bravo."

"Shābāsh"

E.gr. "ai achchhe aur diyānatdār naukar, shābāsh!", "well done, good and faithful servant!"

CHAPTER XXXII.

The Conjunction "For."

The usual Hindustani representative of this word is "kyoñki" or "kyūñki," which was originally two words, *viz.* "kyoñ," "why?", and "ki," "that," *i.e.* "this is the reason, *viz.*"

But the special thing to notice about the use of this word is, that in Hindustani it refers *only* to what has *been last said or written;* whereas in English, "for" may also refer to the *fact that it has been* said or written, or even (sometimes) to some preceding statement. Instances of the former are very frequent indeed in the New Testament, speci-

How to use "Kyoñki"

ally in the Epistles, for the Greek idiom is in this respect like the English; *e.gr.* in John 6: 33, "*for* the bread of God is that which cometh down from heaven, etc.," follows immediately "My Father giveth you the true bread from heaven;" but the former sentence does not give the reason for the latter fact, but the reason for the bread mentioned being spoken of as "the true bread." So in Rom. 1: 18, the "for" at the beginning does not give the reason why "the just shall live by his faith," but the reason why the fact had been mentioned that "the righteousness of God is revealed." Again, in Heb. 6: 4, the "for" does not account for the fact that "this will we do, if God permit," but for the fact of that statement having been made.

Now, in *all* such cases, "kyūñki" should be omitted in Hindustani; else it will be taken by most readers to give a reason for what has just been said; which in most cases would convey no meaning at all.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

The Words "Āge" and "Pīchhe," and their Derivatives.

1. Even in English, there is (or would be, but for the context in each case) some ambiguity in the use of the word "before," and *that* both in respect to time and to place. When we say "before these days," we refer to precedent time; but when we say "in the years that are before us," we

Ambiguous in English

speak of future time. Again, when we say "the tree before the house," we mean what is in front of it, but when we read in a book that a fact has been mentioned "before the present chapter," we understand what has been left behind. But, in English, such ambiguity does not extend to "behind" or "after."

More so in Hindustani

2. In Hindustani, however, not only "āge," but "pīchhe" also, suffer from the same ambiguity. (Neither "sāmhne," which often acts as a synonym to "āge," nor the Urdu "ba'd," which means "after" in *time*, are at all ambiguous; but only "āge" and "pīchhe.") Except in connexion with speeches or books, indeed, "āge," when it refers to space, can only refer to what is in front of one; *e.gr.* "kisī ke āge ghuṭne ṭeknā," "to kneel before some one;" but in speeches and books it is ambiguous; though even here it *more* commonly refers to what is ahead, *e.gr.* "ham is bāt kā bayān āge ziyāda mufassil karenge," "we will expound this matter more in detail further on;" and, in speaking of what has preceded, it is better to use "pahile," and not "āge." But in respect of time, the ambiguity of "āge" is more pronounced. *E.gr.* "āge to aisā hāl na thā," "formerly the conditions were not so;" but "āge ko aisā na karūngā," "in future I will not do so." Indeed, "āge *ko*" is never used of past time, but only of the future. (The Urdu for "āge ko" is the Persian "āinda" or "āyanda," lit. "coming.")

3. So of "pīchhe." "Ghar ke pīchhe" means "behind the house" (and "ghar kā pīchhā" means "the back of the house," as "ghar kā sāmhnā" means "the front of the house"); and "pīchhe" is used, idiomatically, with the name of an agent, or a personal pronoun, in the sense of "in the absence of" so and so.

(We say "behind his back" in this sense, but generally with the connotation of intentional secrecy; but this idea does not come at all into the Hindustani idiom.) *E.gr.* "tum ne mere pīchhe kaun kaun sabaq paṛhe?" "what lessons did you learn while I was away?"; "āp ke pīchhe maiñ viyog ke dukh meñ ḍūbā thā," "in your absence I was overwhelmed with sorrow at being separated from you;" "Billī ke pīchhe chūhe khelte haiñ," "when the cat is away the mice play." So far is this recognized as the meaning of "pīchhe" when said of persons, that this word is avoided, for fear of ambiguity, when it has a temporal sense, and "ba'd" employed instead; unless, indeed, the context leaves no room for ambiguity.

4. In reference to *place*, indeed, "pīchhe" never refers to what is in front; but in reference to *time* it is very ambiguous. "Pīchhe ke sab qusūroñ ko mu'āf karnā" means "to forgive all past offences;" but "pahile yih karo, pīchhe us kām meñ lago" means "first do this, afterwards engage in that work."

5. The same ambiguity is found in the derivatives of these words, "aglā" and "pichhlā." "Agle dinoñ meñ" means "in former times;" but "agle Itwār ko" means "next Sunday." So, "pichhle mahīne meñ" means "last month;" but "pichhlī ghalatī pahilī se barī hogī" means "the last error will be worse than the first."

"Aglā" and "Pichhlā"

CHAPTER XXXIV.

ACCURACY AND PERSPICUITY.

1. European languages assume that the hearer or reader has intelligence enough to understand, even though the words said or written do not literally convey the required meaning. But, speaking generally, such an assumption should not be made in speaking or writing Hindustani. There are, indeed, certain figures of speech which have come down from the time when Indians had more imagination than they seem to have now; but when one goes beyond them, one is likely to give a wrong impression in deviating at all from literality. *E.gr.* when Hezekiah sent to say to Isaiah (Is. 37: 3), "The children are come to the birth, and there is not strength to bring forth," certainly neither the messengers, nor Isaiah, nor any Jew who heard or read that sentence, would take it in any but the political sense that was intended; nor would many, if any, European readers take it in a literal sense; but a Hindustani, unless the passage were explained to him, would understand by it only some calamity which had taken place in Hezekiah's zenana.

Want of Imagination

2. No doubt this extreme literality, or accuracy as they would regard it, is gradually disappearing, owing to increasing contact with European habits of thought; but the European who is new to the country

Disappearing

will do well to be always on the safe side, and, for the sake of clearly conveying his meaning to the minds of Indians, be far more accurate, or literal if he prefers that term, than he would be in similar circumstances in his own tongue.

3. Many instances of this literality, and of the necessity of insertion of words in order to avoid ambiguity, have occurred throughout this work; *e.gr.* the insertion of "parnā," page 149; that of "pānā," page 166; the use of the simple verb instead of the passive, page 98; that of the causal and passive verb instead of the simple one, pages 94 and 99; the insertion of the verb "rahnā" with another verb, pages 171 and 172, the use of the future for the present, when what is spoken of does not yet really exist, page 121; the addition of "hogā" where absolute certainty is impossible, page 120.

Examples

4. Besides these, a few more may be mentioned here. (1) Abstract words cannot be used of concrete things: *e.gr.* God is spoken of in the original languages of Scripture, and in European languages, as the "Hope" of his people; but in Urdu He cannot be called then "ummed," but their "ummedgāh," lit. "their place, *i.e.* object, of hope." Nor can He be called in Hindi their "sharaṇ," though He is in our Bibles constantly called their "Refuge;" but only their "sharaṇ-sthān," "place of refuge."

Not Abstract for Concrete

(2) In general, a town, country, or other place cannot be named in the sense of the inhabitants of the place. Urdu, indeed (whose idiom in many respects more resembles that of Western languages than that of Hindi

Not place for its people

does), can say "sārā shahr darwāze par jamaʿ ho gayā," "all the city was gathered together at the door;" but even *it* cannot say "Yarūshalem aur sārā Yahūdiyā aur Yardan kī sārī girdnawāh nikalkar us ke pās gaīñ" for "Jerusalem and all Judea and all the environs of Jordan went out to him," but must insert "ke log" between "girdnawāh" and "nikalkar;" changing, of course, "sārā" into sāre," and "gaīñ into "gaye."

(3) Figures of speech, which are not in common use, are made much less objectionable to Hindustanis by the insertion of "māno" or "goyā," *i.e.* "as it were," or the addition of the adjectival affix "sā." *E.gr.* "maiñ tum ko māno ukāb pakshī ke pankhoñ par charhākar apne pas le āyā hūñ," "I as it were made you to ride on eagles' wings, and brought you to myself;" where "I made you to ride on eagles' wings," if translated literally would certainly be taken the literally, unless the hearer or reader were instructed beforehand. So, where we can call a person "the shepherd of his people," a Hindustani would say he "apne logoñ kā charwāhā *sā* hai." The same effect is often produced by the use of "ṭhahrnā" instead of the substantive verb alone. Hence, where we might say to a person "thou art my sword." or "my right hand," a Hindustani would say "tū merī talwār," or "merā dahinā hāth," "*ṭhahrā*."

Insertion of Words

(4) One cause of ambiguity in Hindustani, and therefore of devices to remove it, is that third person pronouns have no distinction of gender. Whereas we can say "he" or "she" or it," according to the gender of the thing or person referred to, "yih" and "wuh" are the same in all genders; and therefore often, to obviate ambiguity, the *noun* must be repeated, *E.gr.* in "she kept Joseph's garment by her till his master came

Want of Gender in Pronouns

home," their is no ambiguity, because "his" can refer only to Joseph; but if rendered by "us," this would naturally be taken to refer to the garment. Therefore the translation is: "wah Yūsuph kā vastra *Yūsuph* ke swāmī ke āne loñ apne pās rakkhe rahī,"

CHAPTER XXXV.

Insertion and Omission.

One of the many ways in which Hindustani idiom differs from English is that it often omits words which are necessary in the latter, and often inserts words which the English does not require.

I. **1.** One case of omission is this. When two or more verbs have the same object, whether the verbs are connected together by a conjunction, or the former of them is a conjunctive participle, the object is in Hindustani given *only once*, and not (as in English) repeated in the form of a pronoun. *E.gr.* in English it is "Jehovah God, having made leathern tunics, put *them* on them;" but in Hindi it is "Yahowā Parameshwar ne chamṛe ke angarkhe banāke un ko pahinā diye," the object "angarkhe" being that of "pahinā diye," as much as of "banāke." Similarly, "jise kisī ʿaurat ne lekar tīn paimāne āṭe meñ milā diyā," "which some woman took and incorporated them

Object only once

with three measures of flour;" "jise" being the object equally of "lekar" and "milā diyā." Sometimes, indeed, the object is suppressed, being supplied in thought from another word in the sentence, which suggests it. *E.gr.* "kyā tum ḍākū jānkar talwāreñ aur lāṭhiyāñ lekar mere pakaṛne ko nikle ho?", "are you come out, with swords and staves, to arrest me as if I was a robber?"; where the sense requires "mujhe" between "tum" and "ḍākū," but it is supplied in thought from "mere," because "mere pakaṛne" means the same as "mujhe pakaṛne" would mean.

Omission of Personal Pronoun

2. The personal pronoun as subject is often omitted, when the form of the verb shows clearly what person and number are meant, and there is no special reason for emphasizing them; *e.gr.* "kyā karūñ?" for "maiñ kyā karūñ?", "kahāñ jāte ho" for "tum kahāñ jāte ho?" And besides this, when two connected and consecutive clauses have the same subject, and in English the second clause has a pronoun referring to the noun in the first clause, it is usual in Hindustani to omit the pronoun; *e.gr.* "jab Kanāniyoñ ne yah vilāp dekhā, tab kahā," "when the Canaanites saw this lamentation, they said." So far is this omission idiomatic that, when the verb in the one clause is transitive and in the other intransitive, and therefore the pronoun in the second would normally not be in the same form as that in the first, it is nevertheless omitted. *E.gr.* "we us ke sāmhne gir paṛe aur kahā," "they fell down before him and said;" where, if there was a pronoun in the second clause, it would not be "we" as in the first, but "unhoñ ne."

3. Unnecessary words, though English idiom requires them, are omitted in Hindustani, unless there

And of Unnecessary Words

be some special reason for inserting them. *E.gr.* "he struck him with his hand" is not "us ne use apne hāth se mārā," but "us ne use hāth se mārā," because he could not strike him with any hand but his own. So, "man" (or "dil") "meñ sochnā" is not used, but simply "sochnā," because thinking can be done only in the mind. When, however, there is a reason for inserting such words, they are inserted; *e.gr.* "us ne use apne hāth se mārā" is quite right if stress is meant to be laid on the fact that he struck him with his own hand, and did not get it done by some one else. So, in general, "ānkhoñ se dekhnā" is not good Hindustani, because seeing can be done only by the eyes; but "apnī ānkhoñ se dekhnā" is right, when the point is of a first-hand eye-witness of a transaction. Similarly, while to say in general of Christ, that he "zabān se kahā" any word which may be in question is not good, yet it is quite good to say "us ne yih bāt apnī mubārak zabān se kahī," "he said this with his own blessed mouth," in distinction from His saying anything by His apostles, or others.

II. **1.** On the other hand, words are *inserted* in Hindustani when their omission would in that language lead either to ambiguity, or even to conveying a wrong meaning. *E.gr.* "maiñ tere vañsh ko prithiwī kī dhūl ke ḳinakoñ ke samān bahut karūngā;" where in English it suffices to say "I will make thy posterity like the dust of the earth," because we understand wherein the comparison lies. But in Hindustani it is necessary to add (1) "bahut," because otherwise the comparison might well be thought to consist in the *meanness* of dust, rather than its numberlessness; and

To avoid Ambiguity or Error

(2) also "ke kinakoñ," because "dust," "dhūl," is a collective noun, and therefore cannot be numbered; whereas its *grains*, its "kinak," can be.

2. Often in English one sentence follows another with an *abruptness* which is not idiomatic in Hindustani.

To avoid Abruptness

Often Hindustanis begin a sentence with "so" (in Hindi) or "pas" (in Urdu), or some similar word, to indicate that that sentence has a certain connexion with the preceding. Often, again, a general remark is made, by way of preparation for a following statement, and to show its connexion with the preceding; and in English, such a remark is often introduced by "now" or "and." *E.gr.* in Gen. 13: 7 the general remark, "and the Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelt then in the land" is introduced in order to connect the following sentence, that Abram deprecated strife, with the preceding, that strife arose between his and Lot's servants, in order to give the reason why he could not allow such a state of things to continue. So, in John 4: 6, the remark "now Jacob's well was there" is inserted to show the connexion between the following that Jesus sat on it, with the preceding, that He arrived at the piece of land which Jacob had given to Joseph. In all such cases, it is idiomatic in Hindustani, and makes the same clearer, to insert "jānnā chāhiye ki" at the beginning of the interposed general remark.

3. Often we begin a sentence with "the fact is, that;" but sometimes we omit these words, and our meaning is understood without them. But in Hindustani, "bāt yih hai ki," or "hāl yih hai, ki," should always be inserted in such cases.

4. When we speak of an *event* (not state) con-

Distinction of Event and State

tinuing for a certain length of time, we are really combining two statements, *viz.* of the occurrence of the event, and either of its repetition or of the continuance of its result. But it is clear that an event cannot really continue; and Hindustani expresses this truth by stating what is really meant, *i.e.* the event, and its repetition or the continuance of its result, *separately*. *E.gr.* in Gen. 24: 19 the English (like the Hebrew) runs: "I will draw for thy camels also, till they have done drinking;" but the right Hindi is "maiñ tere ūnṭoñ ke liye pānī bhartī hūñ, aur jab loñ we pī na chukeñ tab loñ bhartī rahūngī." ("Maiñ tere ūnṭoñ ke liye tab loñ bhartī rahūngī, jab loñ we pī na chukeñ" is, though in itself good Hindustani, a clumsy and ineffectual attempt to escape the double sentence; for it passes over the event—her drawing for the camels—and only says that the event will be repeated!) Similarly, "Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thy enemies thy footstool" should be "Tū mere dahine baiṭh jā, aur jab loñ maiñ tere shatruoñ ko tere charaṇoñ kī chaukī na kar dūñ, tab loñ wahīñ baiṭhā rah;" and "Tū mere dahine baiṭhkar tab loñ rah, jab loñ maiñ tere shatruoñ ko tere charaṇoñ kī chaukī na kar dūñ" is both clumsy, and omits the important fact that He is to retain the sitting posture till another event takes place.

Insertion of "Donoñ" or "Sab"

5. When one verb has two or more different subjects, Hindustani idiom requires the insertion of "donoñ" or "sab" before the verb. *E.gr.* "ek hī din meñ Ibrāhīm aur us ke putra Ishmāel donoñ kā khatnā huā," "in one day were Abraham and his son Ishmael circumcised;" "sipahsalār aur sipāhī sab bare khatre meñ pare," "the

general and the soldiers came into great danger." And when the subjects are of different (grammatical) persons, "ham" or "tum" is *also* inserted; *e.gr.* "maiñ aur yih larkā, ham donoñ wahāñ loñ jākar daṇḍawat karenge," "I and this lad will go yonder and worship;" "ai chānd aur ai sitāro, tum sab Allāh kī hamd karo," "praise God, ye moon and stars."

Interjection repeated

6. The interjection of address ("he," "ai," etc.) must be repeated before each vocative, even though the vocatives refer to the same person; and if they refer to different persons, "aur" must *also* be inserted; *e.gr.* "ai Yahūdiyo, aur ai Yarūshalem ke sab rahnewālo," "O Jews and all inhabitants of Jerusalem!"; "He Īshwar, he sab prāṇiyoñ ke ātmāoñ ke Parameshwar," "O God, God of the spirits of all living things!"; "he Yahowā, he mere dādā Ibrahīm ke Parameshwar," "O Jehovah, God of my grandfather Abraham;" "he mere prabhu, he rājā," "O my lord the king!"

"Ānā" and "jānā" Inserted

7. "Ānā" and "jānā" are often idiomatically inserted, where we do not feel the need of them, or else insert their equivalents elsewhere. *E.gr.* when Pharaoh at last told Moses and Aaron to take everything and leave the country, he added: "and bless me also." This is in Hindi "aur mujhe āshīrvād bhī de *jāo*," lit. "and bless me also *and go*." Where we would say to a pupil, "*go and* give this book to that boy," a Hindustani would say "yih kitāb us larke ko *de āo*," "give this book to that boy *and come*." And the imperative of "ānā," *viz.* "āo," is idiomatically inserted before another imperative in the first person plural; *e.gr.* "Āo, ham sab milkar wahāñ jāeñ," "Let us all go there

together;" "Āo, ham apne gunāhoñ kā iqrār kareñ," "Let us confess our sins."

CHAPTER XXXVI.

Emphasis.

"Hi"

1. Hindustani has the great advantage of a particle (*viz.* "hī"), whose sole meaning is emphasis; see this subject treated at large in Chapter XXI.

At End of Sentence

2. Besides this, words are shewn to be emphatic by being put as near as possible to the *end* of a clause or sentence. (This is just the opposite to the rule in all European, and Western Asiatic, languages,) This is why the verb, as a rule, comes at the end of a Hindustani sentence; for Indians regard it as the most important word in a sentence. And while the verb occupies the last place, the other words are ranged behind the verb in order of the emphasis upon them in the speaker's or writer's mind. *E.gr.* "roṭī sāhib ko do," "give bread to the gentleman," is right if the speaker wishes to emphasize *who* it is, to whom bread should be given, as if (*e.gr.*) he should say "roṭī mujhe nahīñ, sāhib ko do," "don't give *me* bread, give it to the gentleman." But if the meaning is "give the gentleman *bread*, don't—just now—give him anything else," then the Hindustani should

be "sāhib ko roṭī do." There are many sentences in the Bible, which the merely English reader misunderstands because, in that book alone of English books, italics are appropriated to another purpose than that of emphasis, and consequently no way is left of indicating the emphatic word. *E.gr.* in Genesis 45 : 26, "he is ruler over all the land of Egypt," not one in 100 English readers knows that the emphasis is not on "all," but on "he." But the Hindī gives the sense of the original by "sāre Misra desh par prabhutā wahī kartā hai." Here, because of the "hī" in "wahī," "sāre Misra desh par wahī prabhutā kartā hai," and even "wahī sāre Misra desh par prabhutā kartā hai," would have conveyed the same meaning; but less clearly than by putting "wahī" next behind the verb. And where there is no "hī," the order is essential. *E.gr.* "Is hukm kā denewālā maiñ hūñ," "It is I that give this order." Here, if "maiñ" had come at the beginning of the sentence, there would have been no emphasis on it, and the sentence would have merely been a statement that "I give this order."

3. There is a third way of expressing emphasis in Hindustani, *viz.* to put the emphatic word in an unusual place in the sentence, and thus to draw attention to it. *E.gr.* "hai to har tarah kī nārāstī gunah," "true, every kind of unrighteousness *is* sin;" "ham to haiñ hī kyā, ki tum ham par kuṛkuṛāte ho?", "what, pray, *are we*, that ye murmur against us?"; "Rām Lāl apnā kām kartā hai īmān se," "Rām Lāl does his work *faithfully*." But such constructions are comparatively rare; and the foreign beginner is advised not to follow them until he has obtained some grasp of the language.

Unusual place in Sentence

CHAPTER XXXVII.

Apposition.

I. When two nouns referring to the same person or thing come together, the general rule is that—

1. Proper names come *after* other designations of the person or thing; *e.gr.* "hamārā Khudāwand Yeshūʿ Masīh," "our Lord Jesus Christ" (in English, "Jesus Christ our Lord" is equally good, and means the same; but this transposition is impossible in Hindustani); "Rājā Chandragupta," "king Chandragupta" (or "Chandragupta the king"). And specially is this order necessary, when the other designation has an adjective attached to it; *e.gr.* "us kā bāp Mohan Lāl," "Mohan Lal his father;" "merā Parameshwar Yahowā," "Jehovah my God;" "us prasiddha tīrtha Banāras meñ," "in Benares, that famous place of pilgrimage." If, however, "nām" is introduced, this order is reversed; *e.gr.* "Ismaʿīl nām Ibrahīm kā beṭā," "Abraham's son named Ishmael;" "Yarūshalem nām Yahūdiyoñ kī rājdhānī," "the capital city of the Jews, called Jerusalem."

Designations

2 This last-named rule is probably the reason why such constructions as "Barnabā aur Paulus rasūloñ ne yih dekhā," "the apostles, Barnabas and Paul, saw this" are right; *i.e.* "nām" is *understood* after "Paulus."

Apparent Exceptions

But when, according to the *general* rule above mentioned, the designation comes *first*, and is in the plural, in most parts of the country it drops its termination: *e.gr.* "apne dās" (not "dāsoñ") "Ibrāhīm, Ishāk, aur Yākūb ko smaraṇ kar," "remember thy servants Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." But the Delhi idiom retains it even in these circumstances; *e.gr.* "wuh Lukāūniyā ke *shahroñ* Lustra aur Dirbe aur un ke girdnawāh meñ bhāg gaye," "they fled to Lystra, Derbe, cities of Lycaonia, and their neighbourhood."

II. When two adjectives qualify the same noun, and one is a possessive pronoun, this always takes precedence of the other; which is in many cases opposite to the rule in English. *E.gr.* we say in English "this my son," but in Hindustani "merā yih beṭā;" we say "that your brother," but they say "tumhārā wuh bhāī;" we say "he told of that country of his, in which milk and honey flow," but they say "us ne apne us desh kā varnan kiyā, jis meñ dūdh aur madhu kī dhārāeñ bahtī haiñ."

Possessive Pronoun

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

QUOTATION.

One of the most striking differences between Hindustani idiom and that of European languages is in respect of quotations; and *that* in two different ways.

I. With us, quotations are of two kinds, *viz.* "direct," in which the actual words (real or supposed) of a person are given; and "indirect," in which the substance of his words is given, but from the point of view of the person who quotes. *E.gr.* "he said '*I am* sick'" is a direct quotation; "he said *he was* sick" is an indirect quotation. As a rule, in English the indirect form is preferred in *short* quotations, the direct form in long ones (except in newspaper reports of speeches, which are in the indirect form, however long they may be). But Hindustani quotations are almost always *direct*; and yet it generally introduces it by "ki," as we commonly introduce an *indirect* quotation with "that." And the translation of an English indirect quotation into a Hindustani direct one necessitates several changes *viz.*—

Only Direct Quotation

1. The *tense* of a saying must be altered. *E.gr.* "he told me it *was* thundering" is "us ne mujh se kahā ki bādal garaj *rahā hai*;" "Master told me I *had* to commit to memory 100 lines" is "Guru

Tense Altered

mahāshay ne mujh se kahā ki tujhe sau pankti kanṭh karnī *hongī*."

2. The *person* of the pronouns and verbs must likewise be changed. *E.gr.* "Yākūb ne Rāhel ko batā diyā ki *maiñ terā* phupherā bhāī *hūñ*," "Jacob told Rachel that *he was her* sister's son;" "I told her *she* would never see me again," "maiñ ne us se kahā ki *tum* phir mujhe dekhne na pāogī;" "she replied that *she* never *wished* to see *me* again," "us ne jawāb diyā ki *maiñ* phir *tumheñ* dekhnā chāhtī bhī nahīñ *hūñ*."

Person Altered

3. Often "yih" has to take the place of "wuh." *E.gr.* "tū ne mujhe kyoñ nahīñ batāyā ki *yah merī* strī *hai?*", "why didst not thou tell me that *she was thy* wife?" Here, Pharaoh would *himself* speak of Sarai as "wah;" but when he made a quotation, although only supposed and desired, from Abram's mouth, he used "yah;" for *if* Abram *had* said this to Pharaoh, he would certainly have said "yah" about his wife.

"Yih" for "Wuh"

4. Sometimes a noun has to be substituted for a pronoun. *E.gr.* "tum apnī ānkhoñ se dekhte ho ki jo ham se bol rahā hai so *Yūsuph* hī hai," "ye see with your own eyes that it is *I* that am speaking with you." Here, the brethren could not say "maiñ hī hūñ," though the Hebrew and the English use the first-person pronoun; and because Joseph is quoting *their* supposed words, and *they* would have said "Joseph," not "I."

Noun for Pronoun

II 1. This last example exemplifies another way

Quotation of Mental Actions

in which Hindustani idiom, in respect of quotation, differs from that of European languages; that Hindustanis quote not only spoken or written *words*, but thoughts, knowledge, feelings, desires, hopes, fears, experiences (whether of the five outward senses—as in the above example—, or a mental experience), all such acts, whether outward or inward. And consequently, all *such* quotations also (though we would not call them quotations) require the various modifications of words in a sentence, which we have mentioned above. *E.gr.* "Yahowā ne *dekhā* ki manushyoñ kī burāī baṛh gaī *hai*, aur un kā har ek bichār burā hī *hotā hai*," "Jehovah *saw* that the wickedness of men *was* increased, and their every imagination *was* only evil;" "agar ghar ke mālik ko *maʿlūm* hotā ki chor kis gharī meñ *āegā*," "if the master of the house had *known* what hour the thief *would* come;" "mujh se Parameshwar kī is vishay meñ kiriyā khā, ki *maiñ* na *tujh* se na *tere* vañsh se kabhī chhal karūngā, par jaisī prīti se *tū* ne *mere* sāth bartāw kiyā hai, taisī hī prīti *maiñ tujh* se karūngā," "swear to me by God that *thou* wilt not deal falsely with *me*, nor with *my* posterity, but according to the kindness that *I* have shewn to *thee*, *thou* shalt do to *me*." (This example is in a sense one of quotation of *words;* but as it does not mean that the swearer must swear in exactly these suggested words, it is really rather an example of quotation of *thoughts*.) "We na *jānte the* ki Yūsuph *hamārī* samajhtā *hai*," "they *knew* not that Joseph *understood them*." "Herodes ne *dekhā* ki majūsiyoñ ne *mere* sāth hañsī kī *hai*," "Herod *saw* that the Magicians *had* mocked *him*." "Use *maʿlūm* thā, ki unhoñ ne *ise* hasad se pakaṛwāyā *hai*," "He *knew* that they *had* delivered *him* up through envy," because He was in Pilate's hands when the latter realised the above fact.

2. Yet it must be observed, that the above rules are by no means absolute. Often their strict observance would land one in difficulty and ambiguity, somewhat similar to that of the use of "apnā" (see Chap. XI, 4). Urdu, which in other respects tends, more than Hindi, towards assimilation with more western languages, is less strict than the latter in altering the tense, person, etc., of a quotation. And the more acquainted writers of Hindustani become with English, the more this tendency increases. On the whole, foreigners should be careful in this, as in all other things, to imitate *only* the *best native* writers and speakers.

Exceptions

CHAPTER XXXIX.

Reduplication.

1. In many languages, the same word is immediately repeated once, without any thought of the meaning of the first word being thereby just doubled, but rather of its being *multiplied indefinitely*. But *in what sense* multiplied? *Here* is the difference between this usage in Hindustani, and the same in European, and other, languages. In the latter, reduplication signifies *intensification* of the

Not for Intensification but for Repetition

meaning of the word; in Hindustani, it *never* denotes this (though many Europeans think, and some even maintain, that it does); but always *repetition; whether in different individuals, or in time.* The former kind of repetition we commonly speak of as "*distribution;*" the latter, as *continuance.*

Distribution

2. Some examples of distributive reduplication will now be given. "Āhiste āhiste chalo," not "go very slowly," but simply "go slowly," because Indians think of the slowness of *each step.* "Ghar ghar meñ," "in every house," "from house to house." "We apne apne ghar gaye," "they went each to his own house." "Us peṛ ke hare hare patte haiñ." not "that tree has very green leaves," but simply "that tree has green leaves," the greenness of each leaf being considered. "Sāf sāf likho," not "write very plainly," but simply "write plainly," regard being had to the plainness of each word. "Wuh apnā khānā garm garm khātā hai," not "he eats his food very hot," but simply "he eats his food hot," because each of his mouthfuls is hot. "Manda manda pawan bah rahī thī," not "a very gentle wind was blowing," but "a gentle wind was blowing," because each gust of it was gentle. "Parameshwar kā Ātmā jal ke ūpar ūpar mandalātā thā," "the Spirit of God hovered over the water," *i.e.* moving from place to place over it. "Us ne in sabhoñ ko leke bīch bīch se do do ṭukṛe kar diyā," "he took all these, and divided each of them in two parts in the middle;" "do" being repeated because *each* was divided, and "bīch" being doubled because the middle of *each* is referred to. So "bīch bīch meñ," "at intervals," or "between *every* two" of things or acts or events which may be referred to. "Unhoñ ne tere ghar meñ kyā kyā dekhā hai?", "what have they seen in thy house?"

3. This last example illustrates the fact, that doubling a word is often a very convenient way, in Hindustani, of expressing its *plurality*. "Kyā dekhā?" would imply that the interrogator only expected that they had seen *one* thing; but forasmuch as he suspected they had seen *many* things, he asks "kyā kyā dekhā?" So, "jāti jāti ke log," "people of different races;" "Injīl kī bashārat qaum qaum meñ kī jāegī," "the gospel will be proclaimed among all nations; "us kā rāj desh desh meñ phail gayā," "his kingdom spread over many countries."

Plurality

4. Examples of *continuative* reduplication will now be given. "Parameshwar us laṛke ke sāth sāth rahā," "God continued with that lad," *i.e.* at each moment of his life; "maiñ tere āge āge chalūngā," "I will go on before thee," keeping about the same distance ahead all the time; "pīchhe pīchhe chale āo," "follow on behind," *i.e.* keeping the same distance behind all the time.

Continuation

5. This continuative reduplication is specially seen in *participles; viz.* the past, the present, and the conjunctive participles. It is not very often that the past participle is doubled; but a good example of it is "us ne phurtī se ghaṛā utārkar hāth meñ *liye liye* us ko pilā diyā," "she quickly took the pitcher down, and *while holding* it in her hand, gave him to drink;" each moment of the time, while she had it in her hand, being considered. The doubling of the conjunctive participle indicates that the same acts are repeated several times; *e.gr.* "unhoñ ne anjīr ke patte joṛ joṛkar langoṭ banā liye," "they made aprons for themselves by joining together fig-leaves," every two

In Participles

fig-leaves requiring a separate sewing. So, "us ne kīleñ ṭhoñk ṭhoñkke sandūq taiyār kiyā," "he made a box by hammering nails in," each nail requiring a separate hammering.

6. The present participle is reduplicated for two reasons. Sometimes the object is to indicate that another action takes place *while* the process expressed by the present participle takes place. In this case "hī" is generally inserted between the two occurrences of the present participle; *e.gr.* "Yākūb kī jāngh kī nas us se malayuddha karte hī karte charḥ gaī," "the sinew of Jacob's thigh got strained *just as* he was wrestling with him."

One Reason

7. The other, and more common, use of reduplication in the case of the present participle is to express that the same kind of action goes on *until* some other event takes place. This other event may be another act of the same agent, or it may be quite independent of him. Examples of the former are: "wuh ghūmte ghūmte mere ghar par nikal āyā," "he wandered on until he turned up at my house;" "Abrām jāte jāte Shekem ke sthān meñ pahunch gayā," "Abram went on till he arrived at the site of Shechem;" "rājā bhāgte bhāgte unhīñ meñ gir pare," "the kings fled on, and (in course of their fleeing) fell into those (pits);" "hote hote sab khamīr ho gayā," "gradually it all became leavened," lit. it went on becoming, and at last became, leavened;" "wah paṛhte paṛhte baṛā Paṇḍit ho gayā," "he went on studying, until he became a great scholar." Indians are specially fond of using the same verb both in the repeated present participle and also in the following verb; *e.gr.* "sūraj ḍūbte ḍūbte ḍūb gayā,"

The Other Reason

"the sun sank lower and lower till it set;" "shatru dabte dabte dab jāenge," "the enemies will be more and more subdued, and at last will be quite subdued;" "jal baṛhte baṛhte pṛithiwī par bahut hī baṛh gayā," "the water went on increasing, till it had increased very much indeed upon the earth." An instance, which to us Europeans sounds odd, but is quite idiomatic, is "Wuh marte marte bach gayā," "he drew nearer and nearer to death, but yet recovered."

Change of Subject

8. Examples of the present participle referring to one subject, and the following verb to another. "Us ke phirte phirte thailī kā jal chuk gayā," "as she was wandering about, the water in the bag was finished;" "Ishāk ke dāsoñ ko usī nāle meñ khodte khodte jal kā ek sotā milā," "Isaac's servants went on digging in the same valley, and at last struck a spring of water;" "Yākūb ko Panūel se chalte chalte sūraj uday ho gayā," "as Jacob was travelling from Penuel, the son rose upon him." Specially is the repeated present participle of "honā" used in this way, so that "hote hote" becomes practically an adverb, meaning "gradually." *E.gr.* one of the above examples, "wuh paṛhte paṛhte baṛā Pandit ho gayā," might just as well be "wah hote hote baṛā Pandit ho gayā." So, "hote hote ham is kām meñ nipuṇ ho jāenge," "we shall gradually become adept in this work."

"Hī" in Reduplication

9. When "kā" ("ke," "kī"), "hī," or "to" are added to a word reduplicated, they are put *between* its two occurrences. Examples of this use of "hī" are: "man hī man," "mentally," *i.e.* "only in mind;" "un shahroñ meñ sirf das hī das ādmī rah gaye," "in each of those cities only ten men were left;" "sārī pṛithiwī ke ūpar

jal hī jal rahā," "over the whole earth there was nothing but water;" "latār miṭṭī ke gaṛhe hī gaṛhe the," "there was nothing but pits of slimy earth;" "sāre Misra desh meñ lohū hī lohū ho gayā," "in the whole land of Egypt there came to be nothing but blood;" "us ne terī is prajā se burāī hī burāī kī hai," "he has done only evil to these thy subjects."

10. The similar insertion of "kā" does not, like that of "hī," convey the meaning that the thing spoken of *fills up* some space, occupies the *whole* of it; but only that of the *uninterrupted multitude* of it, without reference to the space occupied by it; as if one thing succeeded another of the same kind, and still another and another came; *e.gr.* "hamāre bārah ke bārah firqe dil o jān se rāt din ʿibādat kīyā karte haiñ," "our twelve tribes" (not one, or some, but *all* the twelve) "day and night worship with heart and soul;" "maiñ tere gharoñ meñ jhuṇḍ ke jhuṇḍ dāñs bhejūngā," "I will send into thy houses continuous swarms" (one swarm closely following another, swarm upon swarm) "of horse-flies." Similar are the common phrases "sab kā sāb," "the whole without exception," "sab ke sab," "all without exception."

"Kā" in Reduplication

11. "To" is inserted between two occurrences of the same verb in the same form. See an example of this in the simple past, in Chapter XVIII, section 4, 1. But this idiom is most frequently found in the imperative or subjunctive (whichever one may prefer to call it). In all these cases, the meaning is that what is expressed by the repeated word may be conceded, but this concession does not alter something else, now to be stated. *E.gr.*

"To" in reduplication

"Yahowā hī tumhārā sang de to de," "Jehovah may assist you if He likes," *i.e.* "I am sure no one else will, and His assistance alone will avail you nought." "Tum ko jaisā achchhā lage waisā hī vyavahār un se karo to karo, par in purushoñ se kuchh na karo," "deal with them, if you like, just as you please; but do nothing to these men." "Haurā karo to karo, par tumhārā satyānāsh ho jāegā;" "make as much noise as you like, but you will be utterly destroyed;" "apnī apnī kamar kaso to kaso, par tumhārā satyānāsh ho jāegā," "gird yourselves as tight as you will, but," etc.; "kaho to kaho, par tumhārā kahā ṭhahregā nahīñ," "say what you like, but your saying will not come to pass."

12. Lastly, though words are never doubled in Hindustani for the sake of intensification, yet they are sometimes reduplicated for the sake of *emphasis*. *E.gr.* when one wishes to deny something very emphatically, one may say "Nahīn, nahīñ."

Emphasis

CHAPTER XL.

Some Wrong Idioms, Commonly used by Europeans, and their Indian Imitators.

For the sake of foreign missionaries just beginning to learn Hindustani, it may be as well at once to warn them against learning the idiom from (1) servants, (2) tradespeople, (3) Indian Christians; because all these imitate the corrupt idiom which has, alas! become common in the ordinary European and Anglo-Indian

community in India. One is sorry to have to include Indian Christians here; and of course it is not meant that *none* of them speak their own language idiomatically; but the *great majority* of them follow the corrupt idiom; and even those converted in middle life find it very hard to resist the influence of the community which they have joined.

"Behold"

1. There are two Hebrew idioms, which have found their way into the Greek of the New Testament, and into the English of every English Bible; but are not Hindustani, and should not be reproduced in a Hindustani version. One is "behold," inserted simply to draw the reader's attention to what follows, or (in a recorded conversation) to draw the hearer's attention to what is about to be said. In all cases where this is the only object of its insertion, it should be omitted in Hindustani. But where real seeing is in question, either with the bodily eyes or mentally (as in a dream), it should be expressed in some other way (not by "dekho"). *E.gr.* "In my dream, behold, a vine was before me" is, in Hindi, "mujhe swapna meñ *kyā dekh paṛā*, ki mere sāmhne ek dākhlatā hai."

"It came to pass"

2. The other idiom alluded to is the insertion of "it was that," or "it came to pass that," in a narrative of the past, and "it shall be that," or "it shall come to pass that," in a prediction of the future. These insertions are clearly superfluous, and should be omitted in a Hindustani translation. Only when the reference is to what has *preceded* are they in place. *E.gr.* "as he had predicted, so it came to pass" is rightly "jaisī us ne peshīñgoī kīī thī, waisā hī huā."

3. We are accustomed to use the word "thing" in several connexions, when we know quite well what sort of thing we mean, only it is idiomatic in English to callit a "thing." But in such cases, Hindustanis do *not* use the word "chīz," but the name of the thing intended. *E.gr.* "take away the tea-*things*" is not "Chā kī chīzeñ uṭhāo," but "chā ke *bartan* uṭhāo." So, we say to a child, "put on your *things*," meaning clothes; therefore we must say in Hindustani, "apne *kapṛe* pahino."

"Thing"

4. "Diqq" is an adjective, meaning "bothered," *e.gr.* "maiñ bahut diqq hūñ," "I am very worried;" "Lūt bedīnoñ ke nāpāk chāl chalan se diqq thā," "Lot was vexed by the unclean behaviour of the godless." But most Europeans treat it as a noun, with the verb "denā." They say "ham ko diqq mat do," which is *wrong*.

"Diqq"

5. "Battī" means "a wick." Hence it may well be used also of a candle, which is essentially a wick; but Europeans call a *lamp* also a "battī," though the greater part of it consists of other substances. The common Hindustani word for "lamp," of any sort, is "diyā."

"Batti"

6. "Khaḍḍ" means a narrow valley between hills, with steep sides, and very little, if any, space at the bottom for cultivation; in ordinary English, a ravine. But Europeans mean by it a "*precipice*;" and hence they talk of falling "*down* the khaḍḍ;" whereas Indians say "wuh khaḍḍ *meñ* girā," "he fell *into* the ravine."

"Khaḍḍ"

7. "Salām" means in Arabic "peace," but in Hindustani "salutation," whether in act or in word.

"Salām"

In the former case it is used with "karnā," *e.gr.* "us ne apne ustād ko salām nahīñ kiyā," "he did no obeisance to his teacher." In the latter, it is used, *not* with "denā," as nearly all Europeans use it, *e.gr.* "Sāhib ko merā salām do," "give my respects to the gentleman;" but with "*kahnā*," *e.gr.* "Sāhib se merā salām kaho," lit. "say my salutation to the gentleman." But if the "kahnewālā" of "salām" cannot say it directly to the person intended, but only through the medium of a third person, then "ko," not "se," is used. *E.gr.* "Gayus tum ko salām kahtā hai," "Gaius salutes you," lit. "Gaius says a salutation for you;" because he could do so only through the writer.

8. "Tamāsha" means "a sight," "a spectacle," "a scene," *i.e.* something attractive to the sight; generally with a connotation of unworthiness; something which attracts the "vulgar gaze." Hence a "theatre" is "tamāshagāh," which is the exact rendering, in Persian, of the Greek word from which "theatre" is derived. But Europeans use "tamāsha" in the sense of a meeting, even a quite sober, even a religious, meeting. What is called "brawling in church" might, indeed, be called a "tamāsha," for it would attract a crowd, if the crowd knew of it; but not if all goes on "decently and in order."

"Tamāsha"

9. "Baje" is the modified form (both singular and plural, masculine) of the past participle of "bajnā," which means "to emit a sound," when used of an inanimate thing, *e.gr.* a musical instrument, a bell, a gong, and so on. Hence *e.gr.* "chār baje haiñ," "it is

"Baje"

four o'clock," lit. "four have struck;" "kaī," or "kitne, baje?" "what o'clock is it?", lit. "how many have struck?", "maiñ das baje āūngā," "I will come at 10," lit. "ten having struck, I will come." But because "baje" is thus *idiomatically* rendered by "time" or "o'clock," many Europeans imagine that it is the Hindustani for these words. Hence they ask an Indian, "kyā bajā?"; the only proper answer to which question is "ghaṛī bajī," "the clock has struck."

10. "Door" originally mean in English an *opening* in a wall or other barrier. But it has come to mean the piece or pieces of wood, or other material, by which that opening may be closed to ingress or egress; and hence the mere opening is called a "doorway." But the Hindi "dwār," and the Urdu "darwāza," have not adopted this latter meaning: they still signify only the opening. But Europeans, misled by the idiom of their own language, constantly say "darwāza" when they mean the wood which fills up the opening. Whereas this is "kiwāṛ," which applies whether the opening is stopped by a single piece, or by two leaves; *i.e.* either the single piece, or each leaf, is called a "kiwāṛ;" and the latter is also called a "pallā." But "darwāza kholo" is as good as "kiwāṛ kholo" for "open the door;" for when the wood is turned back, the opening becomes a real opening.

"Door"

11. When Europeans use Hindustani verbal roots in English sentences, *i.e.* attach the English terminations to Hindustani verbal roots, they generally insert an "o" between the root and the termination; *e.gr.* "I pakaṛo'd him" for "I caught him;" "she gāo's very sweetly" for "she sings very sweetly." But this habit is wholly needless and

Addition of "O"

not only so, but it is redolent of that *imperiousness*, which every missionary, not to say every English person, should at all costs avoid in dealing with Indians. For it must have arisen at the time, when the European's speech with the natives of the country consisted almost wholly of *orders*.

12. "To boil," when used of water, is "khaulnā" when said of the water, and "khaulānā" when said of the person who boils the water. But when said of something which is boiled in the water, it is "sījhnā" of the thing boiled, and "sijhānā" of the person who boils it. But Europeans constantly talk of "phūṭā pānī," which can only mean "burst water," in other words it is meaningless. "Boiling water" is "khaultā," or "khaultā huā, pānī;" and "boiled water" is "khaulā huā pānī." As to boiling something in water, Europeans commonly use the English word, which of course Indians corrupt into "bail," an ox!

"To Boil"

13. We speak of "handing" a thing to a person, specially at meals, when we either hand food to each other, or get a servant to hand it. And for this, most Europeans have adopted the verb "dikhānā," "to show;" which of course might be equally done by exhibiting the food at the other end of the room. The right word is "denā," which means "to offer" quite as much as "to give;" *i.e.* "denā" does not necessarily imply "lenā."

"Dikhānā"

14. We speak of "*giving*" a name to a person; but "nām denā" is not Hindustani, though generally said by foreigners, and their native imitators. "To give a name" is "nām *rakhnā;*"

"Giving a Name"

and "to" is rendered, not by "ko," or "par," but "*kā*." *E.gr.* "He gave Simon the name Peter" is "Us ne Shamaʿūn kā nām Patras rakkhā;" "what name shall we give this child?" is "is bachche kā ham kyā nām rakkheñ?"

15. Islām being a monotheistic religion, and indeed its view of God being *excessively* transcendental,

Words appropriated to God

Urdu makes a clear distinction, in some of its idioms, between what is said of God and what is meant of a creature. *E.gr.* "Quddūs," "holy," can be applied *only* to God, because He alone is *essentially* holy; and when a creature is called holy, it can only be "muqaddas," lit. "*made* holy." So again, "barakat *denī*" is used, in the sense of "to bless," only of God, because only He can *confer* a blessing; and when a man blesses God, he can only *call* Him blessed, "use mubārak kahnā;" and when one man blesses another, he can either "us ke liye barakat chāhnā," "wish him a blessing," or "use duʿā-i-khair denā," or simply "duʿā denā," lit. "give him a good prayer," or simply "a prayer," in the same sense. (See Chap. XVI, section 10, 4.)

16. There are many sentences in the Bible, and in ordinary English also, beginning "How much more!"

How much more

E.gr. "how much more shall your heavenly Father give good things to them that ask him!" But in these sentences it is evident that the comparison is only between the *certainty* already mentioned and that now mentioned; *e.gr.* it is much more certain that God will give than that earthly fathers will. But if we translate "kitnā hī ziyāda," or "kitnā hī adhik," it will only mean that God will give *more* than earthly fathers will; which is true enough,

but not the meaning of that sentence. Therefore it is rendered in Urdu "kyūñ na degā?" And a similar "how much more!" in 2 Sam. 4: 11 is rendered in Hindi simply by "awashya hī."

17. "Christmas day" is almost universally called "baṛā din" in India. Yet it is a thoroughly unidiomatic phrase; for "baṛā" is *not* used in the sense of "important," as "great" is used in English. In good Hindustani, "baṛā din" can only mean "a long day;" and this is notoriously inapplicable to Christmas day in the Northern Hemisphere.

18. "Bandagī" is the abstract noun formed from "banda," "a slave," and therefore means "a state of servitude;" a very proper word to express a Christian's relation to Christ as *bought* by Him. But, because "service" is *also* used in English for an act or form of worship, "bandagī" has come to be similarly used in Christian Urdu; whereas it should be "ʿibādat" in the sense of the act, and "namāz" in that of the form, of worship.

19. We say "to-night" both when we speak in the night to which we refer, and also in the preceding day; but "āj rāt ko" is right in Hindustani *only* in the *latter* case. When the night is come, there is no need to tell people that it is night! Therefore, in such a case, "āj" alone is good Hindustani.

20. Of many other wrong Hindustani idioms we have already spoken in the above pages, and therefore it will suffice if we now only refer to some of them. (1) For the misuse of "wālā"—perhaps the commonest, and certainly most offensive, of these wrong idioms—see Chap. VII; where it is clearly shown that

Varia

this is an *adjectival affix*, and obviously this cannot be appended to an adjective See also Chap. VIII, 2. (2) For the wrong use of "māngnā" (and even an imaginary verb "mangnā" in the phrase "nahīñ mangtā," instead of "nahīñ chāhiye"), see Chap. XVI, section 10, 4. (3) For the misuse of "gāṛnā," see Chap. XVI, section 23, 12.

CHAPTER XLI.

An Example to be Avoided.

The Ten Commandments in Urdu

Guidance is given, not only by showing the way to be taken, but also the pitfalls to be avoided: and in learning a language, it is well not only to have before one the rules to be followed, but also some examples of what should *not* be done. This we have from time to time done in this book, specially in the last chapter; but now it seems well to give one concentrated example of mistakes to be avoided. This, unfortunately, is the character of the unrevised, and therefore still current, Urdu version of the *Ten Commandments*. We call it unfortunate, because there are few, perhaps no, other passages of the Bible more taught to, and learned by, Indian Christians and catechumens than this; and this fact of course tends to perpetuate, and inculcate, bad Hindustani among all who quote the commandments.

The Hindi version, because it has lately been revised, is almost, if not wholly, free from these errors. We will now point out the mistakes in the Urdu version, which is used by nine-tenths of all the Indian Christians who use Hindustani.

Wrong Imperative

1. And first, the error which runs through all the commandments, of using the ordinary Imperative instead of the one which ends in "nā." These commandments were given *for all time*, and to be obeyed in all circumstances; therefore, as we have explained in Chapter XV, section 12, 3, the form in "nā" should be used. Otherwise, *e.gr.* when the eighth commandment is read out in the form "Tū chorī mat kar," it implies that the people, to whom it is read, are either in the act of stealing or just about to steal. And the use of "mat" instead of "na" only emphasizes this error.

"Tū" Unneeded

2. The "tū," which occurs in all the commandments (in the Urdu version) except the first, is needless, and indeed bad; for there is no emphasis on the subject of the verbs in the original, and the Hindustani Imperative in "nā" is always understood to apply to the person, or persons, so addressed.

Wrong Order

3. In "Khudāwand terā Khudā," which occurs in the 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th commandments, the words are in the wrong order (see Chapter XXXVII, 1). For "Khudāwand" is here a proper name, representing the "Yahowā" of the original, and just as a Hindustani would say "āp kā naukar Rāmdās,"

and not "Rāmdās āp kā naukar," for "your servant Rāmdās," so here he would say "terā Khudā Khudāwand" for "the LORD thy God."

4. The above errors run through the passage; now we come to those which occur in separate places. For the First Commandment "mere huzūr tere liye dūsrā Khudā na ho" is thoroughly unidiomatic. (1) "Before me" *can* mean nothing (in this place) but "beside me," and therefore "mere siwā" is the only feasible Urdu for it. (2) "Dūsrā Khudā" is a contradition in terms, at least in the present age, when "Khudā," whatever it originally meant in Persian, stands exclusively for the *one* God. (3) "Tere liye na howe" is not Hindustani idiom; it should be "na mānnā." The whole will thus read: "Mere siwā aur kisī ko Khudā na mānnā."

"Mere siwā"

Only one "Khudā"

"Na Mānnā"

5. In the Second Commandment, "apne liye banānā" is not Hindustani, unless stress is laid on "apne" (for *thyself*, not for any one else), which is certainly not the case here. Otherwise, "to make for oneself" is "banā *lenā*" (see Chapter XII, section 3, 4.)

"Banā Lenā"

6. "In the water under the earth" (*i.e.* in the water *which is* under the earth") is not "pānī meñ zamīn ke nīche," but "zamīn ke nīche ke pānī meñ."

"Nīche ke"

See page 247.

7. "Apne taiñ na jhukānā" is not Hindustani

idiom, but "jhuknā." Generally speaking, this language avoids reflexive verbs (*i.e.* verbs of which the subject is also the *direct* object; for where it is the indirect object, "lenā" is added, as has just been said); and only allows it when the use of the simple verb would convey a wrong meaning. *E.gr.* "Saul fell upon his sword," evidently with the object of killing himself; but "girā" would leave it open whether it was not an accident; so in that case one must say that he "apne āp ko apnī talwār par girā diyā." But, where there is no constraining reason for using the reflexive form—and certainly there is none in the Second Commandment—its use is to be avoided. See Chapter XIII, 8.

"Jhuknā"

8. In the same commandment, "tīsrī aur chauthī pusht tak" follows the English indeed, but departs from the Hebrew, and *that* in a matter in which Hindustani idiom exactly follows the Hebrew. For "beṭoñ poṭoñ parapoṭoñ ko," "to sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons" is exactly what an Indian would say in a case like this.

Beṭe Poṭe Parapoṭe

9. In the same, "un meñ se hazāroñ par" is shocking, not because it is in itself bad idiom, but because it means that God will shew mercy only on thousands of them who love Him, and will leave the rest to their fate! The "in" of the English A. V., and the "of" of the R. V., mean "in the case of;" and the Hindi well expresses this by "un hajāroñ par."

God's Jealousy not Unjust

10. In the same, "mujhe pyār karte" is particularly bad when God is the object of the verb; for

Not "Pyār" with "ko"

"pyār karnā" with "ko" means to demonstrate love by caresses and similar outward acts, rather than the love itself, which is a mental affection. See Chapter XVI, section 23, 5.

Not "Hifz karnā"

11. In the same, "hifz karnā" is bad because, in Urdu, it only means "to learn by heart," "to memorize;" which is certainly not the meaning here.

"Le" or "Legā"

12. In the Third Commandment, "letā hai" should be "le" or "legā," because of the following future "ṭhahrāegā."

"Yād Rakhnā"

13. In the Fourth Commandment, "yād kar" should be "yād rakhnā." "Yād karnā" is "to recollect," "to bring to mind," *i.e.*, one's own mind, which is the work of a moment; and "to *keep* in memory," which is surely the meaning here, is "yād rakhnā." See Chapter XVI, section 15, 3.

"Kām kāj" singular

14. In the same, "kām kāj" is a *singular* compound noun, meaning "business;" hence the "apne" here should be "apnā."

"Chha din to"

15. "Chha din tak" should be "chha din to;" *i.e.* (1) the "tak" is unnecessary, and if inserted, the following verb must necessarily be, not "karnā," but "karte *rahnā*." And (2)

"to" should be inserted, to show the *contrast* between the work of the six days and the rest of the seventh.

16. "*Thy* stranger," "*terā* musāfir," has no meaning in English or in Hindustani. Therefore "terā" should be omitted, or "koī" substituted for it, as is done in the Hindi.

"**Koī Musāfir**"

17. "Sab kuchh jo un meñ hai" is bad idiom (see page 250). It should be "jo kuchh un meñ hai."

"**Jo kuchh**"

18. "ʿIzzat *denā*" means to *bestow* honour upon a person, *i.e.* exalt him to an honorable position; and very few children even have an opportunity of doing this to their parents. Whereas "to honour" a person is "us *kī* ʿizzat *karnā*."

"**ʿIzzat karnā**"

19. "Mā bāp" is quite idiomatic for "parents;" but as the original says "thy father and thy mother," it is probably better, *here*, to separate them, and say "apne bāp aur apnī mā."

Parents Separate

20. "Terī ʿumr darāz ho" can be said, at least without much explanation, only to an individual, not to a nation; and even if one supposes that individual Israelites are here addressed, yet there seems no sufficient reason for believing that the promise here is one of longevity. At any rate, it is better to translate "thy days may be long" literally, and say (as the Hindi

"**Thy days may be long**"

does) "us meñ tū bahut din loñ rahne pāe," leaving the commentator to fix the exact meaning.

21. "Zamīn" hardly ever means "a land" in the sense of "a country," but rather "land" as opposed to water, and "earth" as opposed to sky. Whereas "mulk" is the regular Urdu word for "country," and "desh" the Hindi word.

"Mulk"

22. In the Tenth Commandment, "jorū" is a word which should be avoided, as it connotes predominantly (to say the least) the physical side of the marriage relationship; and therefore respectable Indians dislike it. "Bīwī," or "bībī" as it is commonly pronounced in India, should be used here (in Urdu).

"Biwi"

23. The form given to the second (and larger) part of this commandment is entirely wrong. The repetition of "aur," instead of "na," implies that the probibition is only of coveting *all* these things of one's neighbours, but *not* of coveting *any one* of them! It should run: "na to apne paṛosī kī bīwī, na us ke ghulām, na us kī lauṇḍī, na us ke bail, na us ke gadhe, aur na kisī chīz kā, jo tere paṛosī kī ho, lālach karnā."

"Na" to be Repeated

INDEX.

(*The references are to the Pages.*)

A and ā, 26.
Ā, masculine ending, 38, 39.
"Ab," 204, 205.
Absolute participles, 104, 111.
Accuracy, 274-279.
Act and State, 84, 85.
Active verbs, 85.
Actual Present and Imperfect, 105, 106.
Adjectives, 57-59.
Adverbs, 94, 95.
"Age," 271-273.
Agglutinative languages, 6.
"Ai," 268, 269.
Analytical languages, 6.
"Āp," 107, 108.
"Apnā," 81-84.
Apposition, 285, 286.
Arya, Aryan, 7.
"As," 208, 209.
"Ask," two meanings of, 161.
Aspirates, 22, 23.
"Aur," 196-198.

"Bachnā," 159, 160.
"Baiṭhnā," 183.
"Baje," 299, 300.
"Balki," 199, 200.
"Bandagī," 303.
"Bannā," 155, 156.
"Barakat," 161, 302.
"Baṛhnā," 186.
"Baṛhkar," 136.
"Battī," 298.
"Behold," 178, 179, 297.
"Believe," 189.
"Bhalā," 203, 204.
"Bharnā," 190.
"Bhejnā," 191.
"Bhī," 219-223. More used than "also" or "even" in English, 219-221. Its place in the sentence, 221-223.
"Boil," 301.
"Bolnā," 157.
"But," 198-201.
"Bulānā," 94.
"Bury," 191, 192.

Cases and Postpositions, difference between, 40.
Cases, real, 40, 41.
Causal Verbs, 93-97. Their formation, 96, 97.
Certain Verbs, 137-194.
Ch, 28, 29.
"Chalnā," 145-148. Its radical meaning, 145. It means starting, 146, 147. Vogue, 147. Beginning, 147, 148. Accompaniment, 148.
"Chāhe," 162, 163.
"Chāhiye," 100, 163.
"Chāhnā," 161, 162.
"Chaṛhnā," 183-185.
"Chhūṭnā," "chhuṛānā," 159.
"Chuknā," 181, 182.
Compound Nouns, 54-57.
Compound Sounds, 27.
Compound Verbs, 86-89.
Conditional Tense, 109, 110.
Conditional Sentences, two kinds of, 109.
Conjunctive Participle, 128-136. Its three forms, 128, 129. How to avoid repeti-

tion of it, 129. More used by natives than by foreigners, 130. Its meanings, 130-132. Attached to what word, 132, 133. Partakes of negative quality of negative verb, 133, 134. Partakes of passive quality of passive verb, 134, 135. Difference between it and the modified past participle, 135.
Connexions of verbs, 90, 91.
Consonants, 23.
Correspondent Words, 233-236.

"Ḍālnā," as second member of compound Verb, 89.
"Dekhnā," 178-180. Meaning "to read," 179.
"Dekho," right and wrong use of, 178, 179.
"Denā" as second member of Compound Verb, 88, 89. In the sense of permission, 166, 167.
Dentals, 21.
Development of Language, 4-6.
Dialect, its difference from Language, 3, 4.
"Dikhānā," 301.
Diphthongs, 29.
"Diqq," 298.
Direct quotation, 287.
"Ḍhālnā," 187, 188.
"Donoñ," insertion of, 69, 70.
"Door," 300.
Dravidian languages, 9.

E, 26.
Education retards tendencies of Language, 4.
"Ek," 65-67.
Emphasis, 213, 214, 283, 284, 296.
"Enough," 265, 266.
Essence of Language, 5.
Essential rules in pronunciation of Hindustani, 32, 33.

F, pronounced instead of ph, 35.
Families of Language, 6, 7.
"For" (conjunction), 270, 271.
Foreign Words in Hindustani, 17.
Future Tense, 117-121.

Genders of Nouns, 36-39. Why neglected by foreigners, 36, 37. Causes of them, 37.
"Giving a name," 301, 302.
"Ghaṭnā," 186, 187.
"Ghaṭkar," 136.
"Ghosh" and "Aghosh," 20, 34.
Greek, exercised no influence on Hindustani, 13.
Gutturals, 24.

H, seldom misused, 34.
Habitual Present and Imperfect, 106.
"Hāñ," 210-213. Its two meanings, 210, 211. As affirmative, 211. As limitative, 212. In sense of "at the place," 213.
"Have," 192, 193.
"Hāy," 269, 270.
"He," 268, 269.
"Hi," 213-219. The emphatic particle, 213, 214. With participles, 214. With "yih," 215. In alternatives, 216. For exclusiveness, 216. Preferred to "bhī," 216, 217. In sense of "only," 217. Its place in sentence, 218, 219. In Reduplication, 294, 295.
"Hilnā," 192.
Hindi, what it is, 18, 19.
Hindustan, 12, 13.
Hindustani, its dialects and principal divisions, 13-15.
"Hogā," 120.
"Hokar," in the sense of "through," 141.
"Honā," 137-142. Its deriva-

tion and radical meaning, 138. Used for what kind of necessity, 141, 142.
Honorific terms, 75-77.
Hope, requires future tense, 119.
"How much more!", 302, 303.

I, 26.
ī, masculine ending, 39.
ĭ, feminine ending, 38.
Idiom, 1, 2.
Imitation, 72, 73.
Imperative, Form I, 122, 123. Form II, 123, 124. Form III, 124, 125.
Imperfect Tense, 104-109. Two meanings of, 105.
Indefinite words, 254-257.
Infinitive, Form I, 126. Form II, 127, 128.
Insertion, 279-282.
Intention, 119.
Interjections, 268-270.
Interrogative words and sentences, 237-242. Interrogative partiele, 237,238. Interrogative repeated, 239, 240. Interrogative, with negative meaning, 240. Followed by "hī," 241, 242.
"It came to pass," 297.

J, 28, 29.
J for Y, 35.
"Jānā," 144, 145. As second member of a compound verb, 87. With a present participle, 145.
"Jānnā," two meanings of, 169, 170.
"Jo" as conjunction, 250-252.
Juxtapositional languages, 5.
Juxtaposition of consonants avoided, 33.

K becomes ch, 35.
"Kā," an adjectival affix, 59-64. Its derivation and meaning, 60, 61. When omitted, 45. Not always equivalent to "of," 63, 64. In Reduplication, 295. Between two words, 64. Its place in a sentence, 64.
"Kahāñ," special use of, 238, 240.
"Kahlānā," 94, 95.
"Kahnā," its difference from "bolnā," 157. With "se," 157, 158. With "ko," 158.
"Kām denā," 190.
"Karke," 144, 208, 209.
"Karnā," 142-144. Equivalent to various English verbs, 142, 143. With "ko" and with "se," 143, 144.
"Kaṭnā," "kātnā," 188, 189.
"Kaun" and "kyā," 241.
"Ke" standing alone, 45.
"Ke māre," 111.
"Khānā," 99.
"Ko," 46-49. When to use it and when not, 46, 47.
"Kyā" repeated, 239.

Labials, 21.
"Lagnā," 151-155. Its radical meaning, 151. Denotes contact and proximity, 152. Denotes sensation, engagement, and commencement, 152-154. Denotes preparedness, 154. With "kahnā," 154. Denotes attribution, 154, 155.
Language, four constituents of, 1.
"Lekin," 199.
"Lest," 261, 262.
Linguals, 22. They interchange, 33, 34.
Literature retards tendencies of Language, 4.
Local differences in Hindustani, 19, 20.
"Loñ" and "le," two meanings of, 52, 53. With "jab," 53.

"Magar," 199.
"Maiñ" and "ham," 74.
"Māngnā," meaning of, 161, 162.
"Mārnā," different constructions of, 168.
"Mat," 259, 260.
"Maʿlūm hai" and "maʿlūm hotā hai," 142.
"Milnā," 163-165. With "se," 163, 164. With "meñ," 164. With "ko," 164, 165. How it differs from "pānā," 165.

"Na" and "nahīñ," 257-260.
"Na" at end of a statement, 263.
"Nahīñ to," 226, 227.
Nasals, 23.
Nasal, the pure, 34.
"Ne," 54, 112, 113.
Neuter verbs, 91-96. Treated as original, 92. Preferred to passives, 93. Their roots coined, 92, 93.
Negative words and clauses, 257-264.
"Neither" and "nor," 260, 261.
Ng, 34.
"Nikalnā," 188.
Norman-French, 14.
Numerals, 65-70. From 11 to 99; 67, 68.

O, 25, 26.
O wrongly affixed, 300, 301.
Obsolete addition of "oñ" and "hoñ," 79, 80.
"Oñ," a numeral affix, 68, 69.
"One" in English, not translatable in Hindustani, 65, 66.
"Or," 209.
Origins of Hindustani Sounds, 29, 30.
"Orhnā," page xiii.

Pali, 10.
Palatals, 22.
"Pānā," 165-168. How it differs from "milnā," 165. With another verb, 165-167. How it differs from "saknā," 167, 168.
"Par," a postposition, 51, 52. A conjunction, 199.
"Parnā," 148-151. Its radical meaning, 148. It signifies necessity, 148, 149. Denotes object of action, 149, 150. Stands in place of "honā," 150. Denotes giving of a name, 150, 151. Denotes "lying," 151.
Parts of Speech, 2, 3.
Passive verbs, 98-101. Generally avoided, 98. Sometimes preferred, 99.
Past participle, 110, 111.
Perfect and Pluperfect, 113-116. Their uses differ from those of English Perfect and Pluperfect, and between East and West, 114, 115.
Permission, two kinds of, 166, 167.
Persian, its influence in Hindustani, 7, 8. Arabized before coming into India, 13. Its idioms in Hindustani, 18.
Personal Pronouns, 74-80. They have no genders, 77.
Perspicuity, 274-277.
"Phatnā," 187.
"Phir," 201-203.
Pluperfect, its special use, 115.
Politeness, cause of plural in personal pronouns and verbs, 75, 107, 108.
Possessive Pronouns, 80-84. Of first and second persons, 80.
Postpositions, 40-54. Of two kinds, 41, 42. Their origin, 42, 43. Their omission, 43, 44. Not repeated, 44. Combined, 44, 45.
Prakrit, 9, 10.

Present Participle, 103, 104.
Present Tense, 104-109. Actual and Habitual, 105, 106. Not "historic," but as present in a book, 107. Used for proximate action, 107. Without substantive verb, 108, 109. Not used for future, 121.
"Pūchhnā," 160, 161.

Questions, two in one, 241.
Quotation, 287-290. Of mental processes, 289.
"Quddūs," 302.

"Rahnā," 171-173. Often preferred to "honā," 172. Often equivalent to substantive verb, 171.
"Rakhnā," 173-175. When equivalent to "put," 173, 174. How distinguished from "karnā," 174. Practically the causal of "rahnā," 175. Used for naming, 175.
Reduplication, 290-296. Distributive, 291, 292. Continuative, 292. Of participles, 292-294.
Reflexive verbs, 95, 96.
Relative words and clauses, 243-254. Their place in a sentence, 243-245. Reduplicated, 245, 246. The effect on them of an intervening clause, 246. Substitutes for relative clauses, 247, 248. Not repeated, 248, 249. Need support, 249, 250. Never used alone with second person, 252. Not used in Latin fashion, 253.
Resolution of verbs, 90.

S never pronounced as Z, 33.
"Sā," 71-73. Its primary meaning and use, 71, 72. Its secondary use, 73.
"Saknā," 167, 180, 181. It must be repeated, 181.
"Salām," 299.
Sanskrit, 8, 9.
"Sāth denā," 190.
"Se," two meanings of, 49-51. Must be used with Comparative, 58, 59. With neuter and causal verbs, 95. With passives, 100.
Secondary Causals, 93, 94.
Semi-consonants, 24.
Semi-labials, 21.
Semi-vowels, 25.
"Shābāsh," 270.
Sibilants, 21, 22, 33.
"Sikhānā," 191.
Simple Past Tense, 112, 113. When construed with "ne," 112, 113.
Sounds in Hindustani, 21-35. Classified according to organs of speech, 21. Classified by transmission of breath, 23-29. Sounds rejected in Hindustani, 30, 31.
Stages of Language, 5, 6.
Subjunctive, 117-121. How formed, 117. Its old meaning, 117, 118. Its uses, 118, 119.
Substantive Verb, 108. 137-142. What it means, 137. It is only half a verb, 137, 138. How to know whether to use it or "honā," 139, 140. Its derivation, 138, 139.
"Sunnā," 190.
Supergutturals, 21, 22.
Synthetical Languages, 6.

Table of Correspondent words, 232.
"Tak," "talak," 52, 53. Their two meanings, 52. With "jab," 53.
Tatsama and Tadbhava, 10, 11.
"Tamāsha," 299.
Tendencies of Language, 3, 4.
Tenses of Verbs, 101-136. General remarks on, 101, 102.
Ṭhahrna, 175-178. Means "to

stop" and "to appear," 176, 177. Means "to be settled" and "to be proved," 177. Means "to last," 178.
"Thing," 298.
Third Person Pronoun, obsolete or obsolescent, 77, 78.
"Till," when it means "at last," 53, 54.
"Tin," Indian objection to, 67.
"To," No. I, 224-227. Introduces apodosis, 224. Its usage differs in Hindi and Urdu, 225.
"To," No. II, 227-231. Its place in a sentence, 227, 228. Its meaning concessive or limitative, 227, 230. It implies a contrast, 228, 229. It removes ambiguity, 229, 230. It is not really emphatic, 231. In reduplication, 295.
"To-night," 303.
"Too," "too much," 267.
"Tū," 74, 75.
"Ṭūṭnā," 187.

Urdu, 15-17. What is it? 15. Contrasted with English, 15, 16. The kinds of words it borrows from Arabic and Persian, 16, 17.
"Uṭhnā," 182, 183.
"Utarnā," 183-185.
"Urnā," 190.
"Use," to, 193.

Verbs, 84-194. General remarks on, 84-91.
Vernaculars, how formed, 11. How classified, 11, 12.
Vowels, 25-27.

"Wāh," 269.
"Wālā," adjectival affix, 59-64. Its meaning very general, 60, 61. It cannot be affixed to an adjective, 60. It often omits the noun which it qualifies, 61, 62. To what parts of speech it is attached, 62. With what meanings it is affixed to infinitive, 63.
"Whether," 264, 265.
Wish, 119. Not resolution, 121.
"Wuh," 78, 79.

"Yih," 78.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
A 000 039 129 2